Magistri Petri Lombardi
Arch. Episc. Parisiensis

Master Peter Lombard
Archbishop of Paris

Sententiarum Quatuor Libri

The Four Books of Sentences

LIBER PRIMUS SENTENTIARUM.

THE FIRST BOOK OF THE SENTENCES

DE DEI UNITATE ET TRINITATE

DISTINCTIO XVI.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 276-277.
Cum Notitiis Editorum Quaracchi

ON THE UNITY AND TRINITY OF GOD

DISTINCTION 16

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 276-277.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

Cap. I.

De missione Spiritus sancti, quae fit duobus modis, visibiliter et invisibiliter.

Chapter I

On the mission of the Holy Spirit, which comes to be in two manners, visibly and invisibly.

Nunc de Spiritu sancto videndum est, praeter illam ineffabilem et aeternam processionem, qua procedit a Patre et Filio, et non a se ipso, quae sit eius temporalis processio, quae dicitur missio sive donatio.[1] Ad quod dicimus, quia sicut Filius duobus modis dicitur mitti: uno, quo visibiliter apparuit, altero, quo invisibiliter[2] castis mentibus percipitur; ita et Spiritus sanctus a Patre et Filio ac a se ipso duobus modis procedere sive mitti sive dari dicitur: uno visibiliter, altero invisibiliter. Datus est enim visibilis creaturae demonastratione, sicut in die Pentecostes aliisque vicibus, et datur quotidie invisibiliter illabendo mentibus fidelium.

Now concerning the Holy Spirit it must be seen, besides that ineffable and eternal procession, by which He proceeds from the Father and the Son, and not from Himself, what is His temporal procession, which is said (to be) a mission or donation.[1] To which we say, that just as the Son is said to be sent in two manners: in one, whereby He has visibly appeared, in the other, whereby He is invisibly[2] perceived by chaste minds; so also the Holy Spirit is said either to be sent or to be given by the Father and the Son and by Himself in two manners: in one visibly, in the other invisibly. For He has been given by the demonstration of a visible creature, just as (He was) on the day of Pentecost and at other times, and He is given daily by invisibly gliding into the minds of the faithful.

Et primo agamus de illo missionis modo, qui fit visibili specie. De hoc Augustinus in secundo libro de Trinitate[3] ita ait: « In promptu est intelligere de Spiritu sancto, cur missus et ipse dicatur. Facta est enim quaedam creaturae species ex tempore, in qua visibiliter ostenderetur Spiritus sanctus, sive cum in ipsum Dominum corporali specie columbae descendit, sive cum in die Pentecostes factus est subito de caelo sonus, quasi ferretur flatus vehemens, et visae sunt illis linguae divisae sicut ignis, qui et insedit super unumquemque eorum. Haec operatio visibiliter expressa et oculis

And first let us deal with that manner of mission, which comes to be by visible species. Of this (St.) Augustine in the second book On the Trinity[3] thus says: « It is easy [in promptu] to understand of the Holy Spirit, why He is also said (to have been) sent. For a certain visible species of a creature was wrought in time, in which the Holy Spirit was visibly shown, either when, in the corporal species of a dove, He descended upon the Lord Himself, or when on the day of Pentecost there suddenly came to be a sound from Heaven, like a vehement blowing was put in motion

oblata mortalibus missio Spiritus sancti dicta est, non ut appareret eis[4] ipsa substantia, qua et ipse invisibilis et incommutabilis est, sicut Pater et Filius, sed ut exterioribus visis corda hominum commota a temporali manifestatione venientis ad occultam aeternitatem semper praesentis converterentur ». Ecce his verbis aperit Augustinus illum modum missionis, qui visibiliter exhibetur, cum tamen ipse Spiritus in sui natura non videatur, qui nec in illis creaturis magis erat quam in aliis, sed ad aliud. In illis enim erat, ut per eas ad homines veniens[5] ostenderetur esse in illis, ad quos illae creaturae veniebant. Non enim Spiritus sanctus temporali motu tunc venit vel descendit in homines, sed per temporalem motum creaturae significata est spiritualis et invisibilis Spiritus sancti infusio. Et ut apertius dicam, per illum modum missionis Spiritus sancti corporaliter exhibitum monstrata est spiritualis et interior missio sancti Spiritus sive donatio, de qua agendum est.

[ferretur], and by them were seen divided tongues, as of a fire, which settled [insedit] upon each of them. This working visibly expressed and offered to the eyes of mortals is said (to be) he mission of the Holy Spirit, not that there appeared to them[4] the Substance Itself, in which He Himself is also invisible and incommutable, just as the Father and the Son (are), but so that men's hearts moved completely by exterior sights [visis] might be converted by a temporal manifestation of the One coming, to the hidden eternity of the One always present ». Behold, with these words (St.) Augustine reveals [aperit] that manner of mission, which is exhibited visibly, even though [cum tamen] the Holy Spirit is not seen in His own Nature, Who was not even in those creatures more than in others, but (rather was there) for another (purpose). For He was in those, so that coming[5] through them to men He might show that He is in those, to whom those creatures came. For the Holy Spirit did not then come and/or descend into men by a temporal movement, but through the temporal movement of a creature there was signified the spiritual and invisible infusion of the Holy Spirit. And to speak more openly, through that manner of the Holy Spirit's mission, exhibited corporally, there was demonstrated the Holy Spirit's spiritual and interior mission or donation, which is (yet) to be dealt with.

Sed prius quaerendum est, cum Filius dicatur minor Patre secundum missionem, qua in forma creata apparuit, cur et Spiritus sanctus non dicatur similiter minor Patre, cum in forma creata apparuerit.[6] Nam de Filio, quod minor sit Patre secundum formam, qua missus apparuit, aperte ostendit Augustinus in quarto libro de Trinitate[7] dicens: « *Misit Deus Filius suum factum ex muliere, factum sub lege*, usque adeo parvum, ut factum; eo itaque missum, quo factum. Fateamur ergo factum minorem, et in tantum minorem, in quantum factum, et in tantum factum, in quantum missum ». Ecce habes, quia Filius, in quantum est missus, id est factus, minor est Patre. Cur ergo Spiritus sanctus non dicitur minor Patre, cum et ipse creaturam assumserit in qua apparuit? Quia aliter Spiritus assumsit creaturam, in qua apparuit, aliter Filius. Nam Filius accepit per

But before (this) there must be asked, since the Son is said (to be) less than the Father according to the mission, whereby He appeared in a created form, why the Holy Spirit is not also said similarly (to be) less than the Father, since He appeared in a created form.[6] For of the Son, that He be less than the Father according to the form, whereby He appeared as One sent, (St.) Augustine openly shows in the fourth book On the Trinity[7] saying: « *God sent His own Son, made out of a woman, made under the Law*, even to the extent that (He was) tiny, as one made; and thus sent for the reason that (He was) made. Let us admit, therefore, that (He has been) made less, and inasmuch as (He is) less, insomuch (Has he been) made, and inasmuch as (He has been) made, insomuch (Has he been) sent ». Behold you have, that the Son, inasmuch as He has been sent, that is made, is less

unionem,[8] Spiritus vero non. Filius enim accepit hominem ita, ut fieret homo: Spiritus vero sanctus non ita accepit columbam, ut fieret columba. De hoc Augustinus in secundo libro de Trinitate[9] ita ait: « Ideo nusquam scriptum est, quod Deus Pater maior sit Spiritu sancto, vel Spiritus sanctus minor Patre, quia non sic est assumta creatura, in qua appareret Spiritus sanctus, sicut assumtus est Filius hominis, in qua forma ipsius Verbi Dei persona praesentaretur, non ut haberet Verbum Dei, sicut alii Sancti sapientes, sed quod ipsum Verbum erat. Aliud est enim *Verbum in carne*, aliud *Verum caro*, id est, aliud est Verbum in homine, aliud Verbum homo. *Caro* enim pro *homine* posita est in eo quod ait:[10] *Verbum caro factum est*. Non ergo sic est . . .

than the Father. Why, therefore, is the Holy Spirit not said (to be) less than the Father, when He Himself has assumed the creature in which He appeared? Because, the Spirit assumed the creature, in which He appeared, in one manner, the Son in another manner. For the Son accepted it through a union,[8] but the Spirit (did) not. For the Son accepted the man thus, that He became Man: but the Holy Spirit did not accept the dove thus, that He became a dove. Of this (St.) Augustine in the second book On the Trinity[9] thus says: « For that reason it has never been written, that God the Father is greater than the Holy Spirit, and/or that the Holy Spirit is less than the Father, because the creature, in which the Holy Spirit appeared, was not assumed in the same manner, as was assumed the Son of Man, in which form the Person of the Word of god Himself was presented, not so that (that Man) would have the Word of God, just as the other wise Saints (did), but because He was Word Itself. For one thing is *the Word in the flesh*, another *the Word (made) flesh*, that is, one thing is the Word in a man, another the Word (made) Man. For *flesh* is posited for *man* in that (verse) which says:[10] *The Word was made flesh*. Not, therefore, in the same manner was . . .

---

[1] Vat. cum aliis edd., exceptis 1, 8, contra codd. *datio*. Paulo ante codd. A B E repetunt *a* ante *Filio*. Denique post *Ad quod dicimus* edd. 1, 6, 8 *quod* loco *quia*.
[2] Vat. et edd. 2, 4, 5, 9 contra codd. et alias edd. post *invisibiliter* addunt *a*, e contra paulo post ante *se ipso* codd. B C E et edd. 1, 8, omittunt *a*. Mox edd. 1, 7 post *mitti* omittunt *sive dari*. Denique ante *creaturae* edd. 2, 3, 7 legunt *visibiliter* loco *visibilis*.
[3] Cap. 5. n. 10. — Vat. et edd. 4, 6 omittunt *ita* ante *ait*.
[4] Codd. D E cum originali legunt *eius*; cod. A *eis eius*.
[5] Codd. B C D E et edd. 1, 6 *venientes*, referendo hoc participium ad *eas*, quod displicet.
[6] Vat. cum aliis edd. contra codd. et edd. 1, 8 non bene *apparuit*. Paulo ante codd. D E et edd. 1, 8 omittunt *et* ante *Spiritus sanctus*.
[7] Cap. 19. n. 26. — Locus Scripturae est Gal. 4, 4.
[8] Solummodo Vat. et edd. 5, 6 addiciunt *personae*.
[9] Cap. 6. n. 11. — Vat. et ed. 6 iterum omittunt *ita* ante *ait*.
[10] Ioan. 1, 14.

[1] The Vatican edition together with the other editions, except 1 and 8, contrary to the codices, reads *giving* [datio]. A little before this codices A B and E repeat *from* [a] before *the Son* [Filio]. Then after *To which we say* [Ad quod dicimus] editions 1, 6 and 8, have *that* [quod] in place of *that* [quia].
[2] The Vatican edition and editions 2, 4, 5 and 9, contrary to the codices and the other editions, after *invisibly* [invisibiliter] add (the implicitly understood) *by* [a], and contrariwise a little afterwards, before *Himself* [se ipso], codices B C and E, and editions 1 and 8, omit *by* [a]. Then editions 1 and 7 omit *or to be given* [sive dari]. Next editions 2, 3 and 7 read *of a creature visibly* [visibiliter creaturae] in place of *of an visible creature* [visibilis creaturae].
[3] Chapter 5, n. 10. — The Vatican edition and editions 4 and 6 omits *thus* [ita] before *says* [ait].
[4] Codices D and E, together with the original, read *His very Substance* [eius ipsa substantia] for *to them the Substance Itself* [eis ipsa substantia]; codex A reads *to them His very Substance* [eius eis ipsa substantia].
[5] Codices B C D and E and editions 1 and 6 reads *so that through those (creatures) coming to men He might show* etc. [ut per eas ad homines venientes ostenderetur etc.].
[6] The Vatican edition together with the other

editions, contrary to the codices and editions 1 and 8, has not so well *when He appeared* [cum apparuit]. A little before this codices C and E and editions 1 and 8 omit *also* [et].
[7] Chapter 19, n. 26. — The passage from Scripture is Gal. 4:4.
[8] Only the Vatican edition and editions 5 and 6 add *of Person* [personae].
[9] Chapter 6, n. 11. — The Vatican edition and edition 6 again omit *thus* [ita] before *says* [ait].
[10] John 1:14.

p. 277

assumta creatura, in qua apparuit Spiritus sanctus, sicut assumta est caro illa et humana forma ex virgine Maria. Non enim columbam vel illum flatum vel illum ignem beatificavit sibique in unitatem pesonae coniunxit in aeternum ». Ex praedictis aperte ostensum est, secundum quid Filius dicatur minor Patre, et quare Filius dicatur minor Patre, et non Spiritus sanctus.

the creature, in which the Holy Spirit appeared, assumed, as was assumed that flesh and human form from the Virgin Mary. For He did not beatify the dove and/or that blowing (of the wind) and/or that fire and join it for ever together with Himself in the unity of (His) Person ». From the aforesaid it has been openly shown, according to what the Son is said (to be) less than the Father, and for what reason the Son is said (to be) less than the Father, and the Holy Spirit not.

Cap. II.

Quod Filius secundum quod homo non modo Patre, sed Spiritu sancto etiam minor est.

Notandum autem, quod Filius, secundum quod homo factus est, non tantum Patre sed Spiritu sancto et etiam se ipso minor dicitur. Et quod etiam se ipso minor dicatur secundum formam servi, Augustinus ostendit in primo libro de Trinitate[1] dicens: « Erraverunt homines, ea quae de Christo secundum hominem dicta sunt, ad eius substantiam, quae sempiterna est, transferentes, sicut illud quod ipse Dominus dicit:[2] *Pater maior me est*, quod propter formam servi Veritas dicit, secundum quem modum etiam se ipso minor est Filius. Quodmodo enim non etiam se ipso minor factus est, qui *se ipsum exinanivit, formam servi accipiens* ?[3] Non enim sic accepit formam servi, ut amitteret formam Dei, in qua erat aequalis Patri. In forma servi etiam se ipso minor est. Non ergo immerito Scriptura dicit utrumque, scilicet et aequalem Patri Filium, et Patrem maiorem Filio; illud enim propter formam Dei, hoc autem propter formam servi intelligitur ». De hoc eodem in secundo libro de Trinitate[4] Augustinus ait: « Dei Filius est aequalis

Chapter II

That the Son according to which (He is) man, is not merely (less) than the Father, but also less than the Holy Spirit.

Moreover, it must be noted, that the Son, according to which He has been made Man, is not only said (to be) less than the Father but (less) than the Holy Spirit and even (less) than Himself. And that He, according to the form of a servant, is also said (to be) less than Himself, (St.) Augustine shows in the first book On the Trinity[1] saying: « Men have erred, transferring those things which have been said of Christ according to the Man, to His Substance, which is sempiternal, as that which the Lord Himself says:[2] *The Father is greater than I*, which the Truth says on account of (His) form of a servant, according to which manner the Son is even less than Himself. For in what manner has He not also been made less than Himself, Who *emptied Himself, accepting the form of a servant* ?[3] For He did not so accept the form of a servant, as to lose [amitteret] the form of God, in which He was equal to the Father. In the form of a servant He is also less than Himself. Therefore, not unmeritedly does Scripture say each, that is, both that the Son (is) equal to the Father,

Patri secundum Dei formam, in qua est, et minor Patre secundum formam servi, quam accepit, in qua non modo Patre, sed etiam Spiritu sancto, nec hoc tantum, sed etiam se ipso minor inventus est ». « Propter quam, ut idem in Epistola ad Maximum[5] ait, non tantum Patre, sed etiam se ipso et Spiritu sancto minor factus est et etiam *minoratus paulo minus ab Angelis* ». « Est ergo Dei Filius, ut ipse ait in primo libro de Trinitate,[6] Deo Patri natura aequalis, habitu minor, id est in forma servi, quam accepit ». His auctoritatibus aperte ostenditur Filius secundum formam servi minor Patre et se ipso et Spiritu sancto.

and that the Father (is) greater than the Son; for the former is understood on account of the form of God, but the latter on account of the form of a servant ». On this same (verse St.) Augustine says in the second book On the Trinity:[4] « The Son of God is equal to the Father according to the form of God, in which He is, and less than the Father according to the form of a servant, which He accepted, in which He has been found not merely less than the Father, but also (less) than the Holy Spirit, and not this only, but also (less) than Himself ». « On account of which, as he says in (his) Letter to Maximus,[5] He has not only been made less than the Father, but also (less) than Himself and the Holy Spirit and even *lessened for a little while less than the Angels* ». « Therefore, the Son of God is », as he says in the first book On the Trinity,[6] « equal to God the Father according to Nature, less according to condition [habitu minor], that is in the form of a servant, which He accepted ». With these authorities the Son is openly shown (to be), according to the form of a servant, less than the Father and Himself and the Holy Spirit.

Hilarius autem dicere videtur, quod Pater sit maior Filio, nec tamen Filius sit[7] minor Patre. Pater enim dicitur maior propter auctoritatem, quia in eo est auctoritas generationis, secundum quam dicit:[8] *Pater maior me est*; et Apostolus: *Donavit ei nomen, quod est super omne nomen*. Cum ergo ait: Pater maior me est, hoc est ac si diceret, donavit mihi nomen. « Si igitur, inquit Hilarius in nono libro de Trinitate,[9] donantis auctoritate Pater maior est, nunquid per doni confessionem minor Filius est? Maior itaque donans est, sed minor iam non est, cui unum esse donatur; ait enim: *Ego et Pater unum sumus*. Si non hoc donatur Iesu, ut confitendus sit in gloria Dei Patris, minor Patre est. Si autem in ea gloria donatur ei esse, qua Pater est, habes et in donantis auctoritate, quia maior est, et in donati[10] confessione, quia unum sunt. Maior itaque Pater Filio est et plane maior, cui tantum donat esse, quantus est ipse, cui innascibilitatis esse imaginem sacramento nativitatis impertit, quem ex se in forma sua generat ». Audisti lector, quid super hoc dicat Hilarius, cuius verba, ubicumque occurrerint, diligenter nota pieque intellige.

Moreover, (St.) Hilary seems to say, that the Father is greater than the Son, and yet (that) the Son is[7] not less than the Father. For the Father is said (to be) greater on account of authorship, because in Him there is the authorship of generation, according to which (the Son Himself) says:[8] *The Father is greater than I*; and the Apostle: *He has granted to Him a Name, which is above every name*. Therefore when He says: the Father is greater than I, this is as if He said, 'He has granted Me a Name'. « If, therefore », says (St.) Hilary in (his) ninth book On the Trinity,[9] « the Father, in the authorship of one granting, is greater, is not the Son less through the confession of the gift? And thus the One granting is greater, but He is not now less, to whom the One "Being" is granted; for He says: *I and the Father are One*. If it were not granted to Jesus, that He shall be confessed (to be) in the glory of God the Father, He is less than the Father. But if it is granted to Him to be in that glory, where the Father is, you have also in the authorship of the One giving, that He is greater, and in the confession of the given ("Being"),[10] that They are One. And so the

Father is greater than the Son and plainly greater (than He), to Whom He grants to be as much as He Himself is, to Whom He imparts the Image of (His own) innascible "Being" by the sacrament of a Nativity, Whom He generates out of Himself in His own form ». You have hear, O reader, what (St.) Hilary says on this (matter), of whose words, wheresoever they occur, diligently take note and piously understand!

[1] Cap. 7. n. 14, sed multis a Magistro omissis. — Paulo ante cod. D *Quod autem* pro *Et quod*; cod. C *Quod*.
[2] Ioan. 14, 28. — Edd. legunt *ait* pro *dicit* contra codd. et originale.
[3] Phil. 2, 7.
[4] Cap. 1. n. 2.
[5] Epist. 170. (olim 66) n. 9. — Omnes codd. et edd. male citant sic: *in libro contra Maximinum* (*vel Maximianum*); Vat. *in libr. Epist. ad Maximum*. Maximus fuit medicus ab haeresi Ariana conversus. — In fine huius loci textus S. Scripturae est Hebr. 2, 9: *qui modico quam Angeli minoratus est*.
[6] Cap. 7. n. 14. — Hic Vat. cum ceteris edd. addit *in* ante *natura* contra originale, nostros codd. et etiam contextum, cum sibi correspondeant verba *natura* et *habitu*. Deinde solummodo Vat. et cod. C omittunt *id est*.
[7] Vat. cum plurimis edd., sed contra codd. et edd. 1, 8 omittit *sit*.
[8] Ioan. 14, 28; et mox Phil. 2, 7. — Ed. 8 verbo *dicit* praemittit *ipse Filius*, quod ceterae subaudiunt.
[9] Num. 54. — Textus Scripturae est Ioan. 10, 30.
[10] Contra originale, omnes codd. et edd. 6, 8, 9 Vat. cum aliis edd. male legit *donantis*. Paulo post ead. Vat. et ed. 4 perperam addunt *et* ante *Filio*.

[1] Chapter 7, n. 14, but with many words omitted by Master (Peter). — A little before this Codex D has *But that* [Quod autem] for *And that* [Et quod]; codex C has *That* [Quod].
[2] John 14:28. — The editions read *says* [ait] for *says* [dicit] contrary to the codices and the original.
[3] Phil. 2:7.
[4] Chapter 1, n. 2.
[5] Epistle 170 (previously 66), n. 9. — All the codices and editions badly cite: *in the book Against Maximinus* (or *Maximianus*) [in libro contra Maximinum (vel Maximianus)]; the Vatican edition has *in the book "The Epistle to Maximus"* [in libr. Epist. ad Maximum]. Maximus was a doctor converted from the Arian heresy. — At the end of this passage, the text of Sacred Scripture is Hebrews 2:9: *who for a little while became lesser than the Angels* [qui modico quam Angeli minoratus est].
[6] Chapter 7, n. 14. — Here the Vatican edition together with all the other editions reads *in Nature* [in natura], contrary to the original, to our codices and even to the context, since *nature* and *condition* are in a parallel construction. Then only the Vatican edition and codex C omit *that is* [id est].
[7] The Vatican edition together with very many editions, but contrary to the codices and editions 1 and 8, omits *is* [sit].
[8] John 14:28; and then Phil. 2:7. — Edition to the verb *says* [dicit] prefaces *the Son Himself* [ipse Filius], which all the others understand.
[9] Number 54. — The text of Scripture is John 10:30.
[10] Against the original, all the codices and editions 6, 8, and 9, the Vatican edition together with the other editions, reads badly *of the One giving* [donantis]. A little after this, the Vatican edition and edition 1 faultily add *even* [et] before *the Son* [Filio].

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XVI.

De missione Spiritus sancti specialiter, et quidem de visibili.

ARTICULUS UNICUS.

Quaestio I.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 277-280.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

Nunc de Spiritu sancto videndum est, praeter illam ineffabilem etc.

DIVISIO TEXTUS.

Haec est secunda pars illius partis, in qua agit de missione quantum ad modum. In hac parte agit de missione Spiritus sancti *specialiter*.[1] Et quoniam missio Spiritus sancti duobus modis est, scilicet visibilis et invisibilis, sicut missio Filii: ideo haec pars habet duas partes. In *prima* agit Mag- /-ister . . .

[1] Vat. contra auctoritatem omnium codd. et ed. 1 primam propositionem ita exhibet: *Supra egit Magister de temporali . . .*

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XVI

On the mission of the Holy Spirit in particular, and indeed of the visible one.

ARTICLE SOLE

Question 1

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 277-280.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

Now concerning the Holy Spirit it must be seen,
besides that ineffable etc..

DIVISION OF THE TEXT

This is the second part of that part, in which (Master Peter) deals with mission as much as regards (its) manner. In this part he deals with the mission of the Holy Spirit *in particular* [specialiter].[1] And since the mission of the Holy Spirit is in two manners, that is, the visible and the invisible, just as the mission of the Son (is): for that reason this part has two parts. In *the first* Master (Peter) deals with . . .

[1] The Vatican edition, contrary to the authority of all the codices and edition 1, exhibits the first proposition thus: *Above Master (Peter) dealt with the temporal . . .*

Mag- /-gister de missione Spiritus sancti visibili. In *secunda* agit de missione[1] invisibili, et hoc infra disctinctione decima septima: *Iam nunc accedamus ad assignandam missionem Spiritus sancti*.

Prima iterum pars habet duas. In prima Magister explicat Spiritus sancti visibilem

the visible mission of the Holy Spirit. In *the second* he deals with the invisible mission,[1] and this below in the Seventeenth Distinction: *Now let us proceed immediately to assign the mission of the Holy Spirit*

The first part again has two parts. In the first Master (Peter) explains the visible

missoinem. In secunda ad maiorem explanationem movet et determinat dubitationem quandam, ibi: *Sed prius quaeredum est, cum Filius dicatur minor Patre* etc.

Prima iterum[2] pars habet duas. In *prima* Magister assignat duplicem modum missionis Spiritus sancti secundum duplicem modum missionis Filii. *Secundo* vero prosequitur de altera, scilicet missione visibili, ibi: *Et primo agamus de illo modo missionis, qui fit visibiliter* etc., ubi dicit, quod missio visibilis est apparitio facta in exteriori signo, per quod monstratur missio interior.

Sed prius quaerendum est, cum Filius dicatur minor Patre etc. Haec est secunda pars distinctionis,[3] in qua Magister movet dubitationes, et habet haec duibitatio ortum ex comparatione missionis Filii et Spiritus sancti. Cum enim Spiritus sanctus mittatur visibiliter, sicut et Filius, quaestio est, quare non dicitur minor Patre, ut Filius. Haec autem pars, in qua hanc quaestionem prosequitur,[4] habet tres partes. In *prima* opponit et determinat, quod Spiritus sanctus non debet dici ex missione minor, sicut Filius, quia Spiritus sanctus non est unitus. *Secundo*,[5] occasione huius adiungit quoddam verum huic annexum, scilicet quad Filius ratione missionis dicitur minor se ipso, ibi: *Notandum autem, quod Filius, secundum quod homo factus est*. *Tertio* docet sane intelligere quoddam verbum dubium, quod est praesenti considerationi coniunctum, quod dicit Hilarius, scilicet quod Pater secundum divinitatem est maior Filio, et[6] Filius secundum divinitatem non est minor, ibi: *Hilarius autem dicere videtur, quod Pater sit* etc.

mission of the Holy Spirit. In the second for a greater explanation he moves and determines a certain doubt, there (where he says): *But first there must be asked, since the Son is said (to be) less than the Father* etc.

The first part again[2] has two parts. In *the first* Master (Peter) assigns a twofold manner of the mission of the Holy Spirit according to the twofold manner of the mission of the Son. But, *second*, he proceeds [prosequitur] concerning the other, that is the visible mission, there (where he says): *And first let us deal with that manner of mission, which comes to be visibly* etc., where he says, that the visible mission is an apparition wrought in an exterior sign, through which the interior mission is made manifest [monstratur].

But first there must be asked, since the Son is said to be less than the Father etc.. This is the second part of the distinction,[3] in which Master (Peter) moves (certain) doubts, and this doubt has its rise from a comparison of the mission of the Son and (of that) of the Holy Spirit. For since the Holy Spirit is visibly sent, just as even the Son, the question is, ‘For what reason is He not said (to be) less than the Father, as the Son (is)?’ Moreover this part, in which he pursues this question,[4] has three parts. In *the first* he opposes and determines, that the Holy Spirit ought not be said from (His) mission (to be) less, just as the Son (is), because the Holy Spirit has not been united (to a creature). *Second*,[5] having concluded this [occasione huius] he adds a certain truth annexed to this, that is, that the Son by reason of (His) mission is said (to be) less than Himself, there (where he says): *Moreover, it must be noted, that the Son, according to which He has been made Man*. *Third* he teaches one to understand sanely a certain doubtful word, which has been conjoined to the present consideration, which (St.) Hilary says, that is, ‘that the Father according to the Divinity is greater than the Son, and[6] the Son according to the Divinity is not less’, there (where he says): *Moreover, (St.) Hilary seems to say, that the Father is* etc..

TRACTATIO QUAESTIONUM.

Ad evidentiam huius partis quaeruntur tria de missione visibili:

TREATMENT OF THE QUESTIONS

For the evidence of this part there are asked three (questions) concerning the visible

Primo quaeritur,[7] quid sit.
Secundo, ad quid sit utilis.
Tertio quaeritur, quibus modis facta sit.

ARTICULUS UNICUS.

De missione visibili Spiritus sancti.

QUAESTIO I.

Quid sit missio visibilis.

Circa primum proceditur sic.

Ostenditur primo, quod visibilis missio non est aliud quam apparitio exterior.

1. Augustinus[8] dicit, quod « tunc Spiritus sanctus vel Filius mittitur, cum ex tempore cuiusquam mente percipitur »: ergo tunc visibiliter mittitur, cum visibiliter percipitur; sed visibiliter percipitur, cum apparet in creatura visibili: ergo visibilis missio non est aliud quam apparitio.

2. Item, hoc ipsum videtur per *simile*, quia *mitti invisibiliter* non est aliud quam per effectum invisibilem invisibiliter manifestari: ergo *mitti visibiliter* non est aliud quam per creaturam visibilem[9] manifestari: hoc autem non est aliud quam visibiliter apparere: ergo etc.

3. Item, hoc iterum videtur *exemplo*, quia Spiritus sanctus in columbae specie dicitur missus ad Filium, sicut dicit Augustinus, et habetur in littera;[10] sed tunc non fuit facta aliqua donatio Filio, quia plenus fuit semper Spiritu sancto: sed solum exterior apparitio: ergo etc.

Sed contra: 1. Quod missionis visibilis non sit tota ratio ipsa apparitio visiblis, videtur, quia[11] Pater in subiecta creatura apparuit, et tamen non di- / -citur . . .

---

processione Spiritus sancti, qua procedit vel mittitur a se ipso, hic agit de eadem quantum ad modum. Et quoniam etc.; sed falso, ut patet ex divisione textus d. 15. p. I. et II.

[1] In Vat. contra mss. deest *missione*.

[2] Ex mss. et ed. 1 supplevimus *iterum*.

[3] Vat., omissis verbis Magistri, ita propositionem incipit: *Similiter secunda pars, in qua*, et paulo infra

mission:
First there is asked,[7] what is it.
Second, for what is it useful.
Third there is asked, in what manners does it come to be.

ARTICLE SOLE

On the visible mission of the Holy Spirit.

QUESTION 1

What is a visible mission.

About the first (the argument) is advanced in this manner:

First it is show, that a visible mission is nothing other than an exterior apparition.

1. (St.) Augustine says,[8] that « then the Holy Spirit (and/or) the Son is sent, when in time He is perceived by the mind of anyone »: therefore then He is visibly sent, when He is perceived visibly; but He is perceived visibly, when He appears in a visible creature: therefore the mission is nothing other than an apparition.

2. Likewise, this very (thing) is seen through the *similar*, that '*to be invisibly sent*' is nothing other than 'to be manifested invisibly through an invisible effect': therefore '*to be sent visibly*' is nothing other than 'to be manifested through a visible[9] creature': but this is not other than to appear visibly: ergo etc..

3. Likewise, this again is seen *by an example*, because the Holy Spirit is said (to be) sent to the Son in the appearance [specie] of a dove, just as (St.) Augustine says, and as is had in the text;[10] but then no donation was made to the Son, because He was always full of the Holy Spirit: but (therefore it was) only an exterior apparition: ergo etc..

But on the contrary: 1. It seems that a visible apparition itself is not the entire reckoning of a visible mission, because[11] the Father did appear in a subjected creature, and yet He is not said . . .

---

procession of the Holy Spirit, by which He proceeds and/or is sent by Himself, here he deals with the same as much as regards (its) manner. And since etc.; but falsely, as is clear from the division of the text, d. 15, p. I and II.

[1] In the Vatican edition, contrary to the manuscripts, *mission* [missione] is lacking.

[2] From the manuscripts and edition 1 we have

ponit *quae habet* loco *et habet haec dubitatio*, obnitentibus mss. et ed. 1.
4 In Vat. desunt verba *Haec autem pars, in qua hanc quaestionem prosequitur*, quae tamen extant in mss. et ed. 1.
5 Codd. cum ed. 1 *Et* pro *Secundo*, sed minus distincte.
6 Fide antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1 adiecimus *et*.
7 Ex vetustioribus mss. et ed. 1 restituimus *quaeritur*. Paulo post in principio quaestionis restituimus ex codd. et ed. 1 verba: *Circa primum proceditur sic*, quae desunt in Vat.
8 Libr. IV. de Trin. c. 20. n. 28. Vide in lit. Magistri, d. XV. c. 7-9.
9 Vat. cum codd. cc, aliis tamen codd. et ed. 1 obnitentibus, *visibiliter* loco *visibilem*; melius legeretur *visibilem visibiliter*. Cod. T *effectum* pro *creaturam*.
10 Hic, c. 1.
11 Sequimur mss. et quinque primas edd. ponendo *quia* loco *sic*. Paulo infra post *ergo* multi codd. cum edd. 1, 2, 3 falso *prius* pro *plus*.

supplied *again* [iterum].
3 The Vatican edition, having omitted the words of Master (Peter), begins the proposition thus: *Similarly the second part, in which* [Similiter secunda pars, in qua], and a little below this puts *which has* [quae habet] in place of *and this doubt has* [et habet haec dubitatio], with the other manuscripts and edition 1 striving against this.
4 In the Vatican edition the words *Moreover this part, in which he pursues this question* [Haec autem pars, in qua hanc quaestionem prosequitur], are lacking, yet they are extant in the manuscripts and edition 1.
5 The codices together with edition 1 have *And* [Et] for *Second* [Secundo], but less distinctly.
6 Trusting in the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1 we have inserted *and* [et].
7 From the older manuscripts and edition 1 we have restored *there is asked* [quaeritur]. A little after this at the beginning of the question, we have restored, from the codices and edition 1, the words: *About the first, one proceeds thus* [Circa primum, proceditur sic], which are lacking in the Vatican edition.
8 On the Trinity, Bk. IV, ch. 20, n. 28. See these in the text of Master (Peter), d. XV, chs. 7-9.
9 The Vatican edition together with codex cc, yet with the other codices and edition 1 striving against this, has *through a creature visibly* [per creaturam visibiliter] in place of *through a visible creature* [per creaturam visibilem], it would be better to read *through a visible creature visibly* [per creaturam visibilem visibiliter]. Codex T has *effect* [effectum] in place of *creature* [creaturam].
10 Here in ch. 1.
11 We follow the manuscripts and the five first editions, by putting *because* [quia] in place of *thus* [sic]. A little below this after *therefore* [ergo] many codices together with editions 1, 2, and 3, false read *it is a mission before (it is)* [prius est mission quam] for *it is more a mission than* [plus est mission quam].

---

di- / -citur visibiliter missus: ergo plus est missio quam apparitio. *Maior* patet, quia Augustinus dicit secundo de Trinitate:[1] « Temerarium est dicere, Deum Patrem Prophetis et Patribus per aliquas visibiles formas nunquam apparuisse ».

(to have been) sent visibly: therefore it is more a mission than an apparition. The *major* is clear, because (St.) Augustine says in the second (book) On the Trinity:[1] « It is rash to say, that God the Father appeared to the Prophets and Patriarchs through some visible forms ».

2. Item, Filius est Spiritus sanctus in veteri Testamento multoties apparuerunt visibiliter, et tamen tempore illo neuter dicitur visibiliter missus, sicut dicit Augustinus tertio de Trinitate,[2] ubi hanc questionem movet: ergo etc.

2. Likewise, the Son and the Holy Spirit in the Old Testament appeared visibly many times, and yet at that time Neither is said (to have been) visibly sent, just as (St.) Augustine says in the third (book) On the Trinity,[2] where he moves this question: ergo etc..

3. Item, omne quod visibiliter apparet, est corporale, cum sensu percipiatur; sed Deus, cum sit simplex, est omnino incorporalis: si ergo ad Deum non spectat visibiliter

3. Likewise, everything which appears visibly, is corporeal, since it its perceived by the sense; but God, since He is simple, is entirely incorporeal: if, therefore, if it does

apparere, ergo si visibiliter mittitur, missio visibilis non est apparitio. *Si dicas*, quod non apparet in se, sed in effectu; *contra*: sic apparet in omni creatura et semper et ubique: ergo secundum hoc visibiliter mittitur in omni cratura semper et ubique, quod stultum est dicere.

not pertain [spectat] to God to appear visibly, therefore, if He is visibly sent, the visible mission is not an apparition. *If you say*, that He does not in Himself appear, but in an effect; *on the contrary*: He appears in the same manner [sic] in every creature both always and everywhere: therefore according to this He is visibly sent in every creature always and everywhere, which is stupid to say.

4. Item, ubi est missio, ibi est manifestatio personae, ut dicit Augustinus;[3] sed per solam apparitionem nunquam est manifestatio, nisi adsit revelatio: ergo de ratione missionis visibilis non tantum est apparitio, sed etiam revelatio: ergo apparitio non est tota ratio.

4. Likewise, where there is a mission, there is a manifestation of a person, as (St.) Augustine says;[3] but through an apparition alone there is never a manifestation, except a revelation be present [adsit]: therefore of the reckoning of a visible mission is not only an apparition, but also a revelation: therefore an apparition is not its entire reckoning.

CONCLUSIO.

Missio visibilis est apparitio, in qua manifestatur divinae personae emanatio et inhabitatio.

CONCLUSION

A visible mission is an apparition, in which there is manifested the emanation and indwelling of a Divine Person.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod missio visiblis praesupponit missionem tanquam superius, et superaddit differentiam, quae est visibile. Missio autem *communiter* dicta, ut dicutm fuit supra in praecedenti distinctione,[4] praesupponit circa missum *emanationem* et superaddit *manifestationem*. Et quoniam manifestastio emanationis, secundum quam attenditur missio, non fit nisi super eum, quem Spiritus sanctus inhabitat per effectum gratiae inhabitantis, hinc est, quod missio de ratione generali dicit *manifestationem emanationis* et *inhabitationis*.

I respond: It must be said, that a 'visible mission' presupposes 'mission' as in the above (sense), and adds upon this a difference, which is the 'visible'. Moreover 'mission' *commonly* said, as was said above in the preceding distinction,[4] presupposes about the one sent *an emanation* and adds above this *a manifestation*. And since the manifestation of the emanation, according to which the mission is attained, does not come to be except upon him, whom the Holy Spirit indwells through the effect of indwelling grace, hence it is, that 'mission' from a general reckoning means 'a manifestation of an emanation and of an indwelling'.

Haec autem differentia *visibilis*, superadveniens missioni, contrahit ipsam quantum ad principale significatum, quod est *manifestatio*: ideo dicit manifestationem cum apparitione, sive appartionem manifstantem personae emanantis inhabitationem[5] vel personae inhabitantis emanationem.

Moreover, this difference '*visible*', imposed upon [superadveniens] 'mission', contracts it as much as regards (its) principal signification, which is a 'manifestation'; for that reason it means a 'manifestation with an apparition', or an 'apparition manifesting the indwelling of a Person emanating[5] and/or (manifesting) the emanation of a Person indwelling'.

Unde concedo, quod visibilis missio est *apparitio*; sed haec non est tota ratio, sed apparitio, in qua manifestatur divina pesonae non tantum ut *operans*, sed etiam ut

Wherefore I concede, that the visible mission is an *apparition*; but this is not the entire reckoning (of it), but (rather) an 'apparition, in which there is manifested a

inhabitans, nec tantum ut inhabitas, sed etiam ut *emanans*, quasi[6] ab alio veniens. Per primum excludit apparitionem Dei in qualibet creatura, per secundum apparitionem in veteri Testamento, per tertium apparitionem Patris, quia Pater non apparuit ut emanans sive ab alio veniens. Filius vero vel Spiritus sanctus in veteri Testamento non apparuit ut inhabitans, sed ut se inhabitaturum praemonstrans, unde Angelus apparebat in illis creaturis in persona Dei. Et hoc probat Augustinus in libro tertio de Trinitate[7] dicens: « Constat firmitate auctoritatis et probabilitate rationis, cum antiquis Patribus dicitur Deus apparuisse, voces illas ab Angelis esse factas ». Et adducit auctoritates Apostoli ad Galatas tertio:[8] *Lex ordinata per Angelos*; et ad Hebraeos secundo:[9] *Si enim qui per Angelos dictus est sermo* etc. Nec tamen dico, quod ista sit ratio, quare non est missus, quia apparitio fiebat ministerio angelico; quia sicut dicit Augustinus quarto de Trinitate,[10] probabile est, quod illa columba, in qua apparuit Spiritus sanctus, secundum ministerium Angeli moveretur. Unde idem in quarto libro de Trinitate[11] in fine dicit: « Super hoc aliquid invenire difficile est, et temere affirmare non expedit. Quomodo tamen ista sine rationali vel intellectuali creatura potuerint fieri, non video ».

Divine Person not only as One *working*, but also as One *indwelling*, and not only as One indwelling, but also as One *emanating*, as if[6] coming from Another'. Through the first it excludes an apparition of God in any creature, through the second an apparition in the Old Testament, through the third the apparition of the Father, because the Father did not appear as One emanating or coming from Another. On the other hand the Son and/or the Holy Spirit in the Old Testament did not appear as One indwelling, but as One showing beforehand that He is going to indwell [se inhabitaturum praemonstrans], wherefore an Angel used to appear in those creatures in the person of God. And this (St.) Augustine proves in the third book On the Trinity[7] saying: « It is established by the firmness of authority and the probability of reason, that when God is said to have appeared to the ancient Patriarchs, those voices were made by Angels ». And he adduces the authorities of the Apostle in the third (chapter of his Letter) to the Galatians:[8] *The Law ordained through Angels*; and in the second (chapter) to the Hebrews:[9] *For if the speech which has been said through Angels* etc.. And yet I do not say, that this is the reason, for which He has been sent, because the apparition came to be by angelic ministry; because just as (St.) Augustine says in the fourth (book) On the Trinity[10] it is probable, that that dove, in which the Holy Spirit appeared, was moved by the ministry of an Angel. Whence the same in the fourth book On the Trinity says at the end:[11] « On this it is difficult to find, and not expedient to dare to affirm, anything. However, I do not see, in what manner that (apparition of His) could have come to be, without a rational and/or intellectual creature ».

1. 2. Et ita patet, quod non quaelibet apparitio est missio, patet etiam responsio ad duas rationes primas.

1. 2. And thus is clear, that not every apparition is a mission; the response is also clear to the first two reasons.

3. Ad illud quod dicitur tertio, quod non sit apparitio, quia Deus est invisibilis; dicendum, quod apparere est dupliciter: vel *in se*, et sic convenit corporali: vel *in alio*, et hoc dupliciter: vel sicut *causa* in effectu, vel sicut *signatum* in signo; et hoc tertio modo missio est apparitio; et secundum hunc modum non convenit omni creaturae.

3. To that which is objected third, that there is no apparition, because God is invisible; it must be said, that "to appear" is in a twofold manner: either *in itself*, and thus it befits (something) corporeal: and/or *in another*, and this in a twofold manner: either just as *a cause* in an effect, and/or just as (something) *signified* in a *sign*; and in this third manner there is an apparition

(of God); and according to this manner it does not befit every creature.

4. Ad illud quod ultimo obiicitur, quod apparitio non est manifestatio; dicendum, quod cum dicitur: missio[12] est manifestatio, non intelligitur . . .

4. To that which is objected last, that an apparition is not a manifestation; it must be said, that where there is said: 'a mission is[12] a manifestation', ("mission") is not understood . . .

---

[1] Cap. 17. n. 32, in quibus verbis Vat. contra antiquiores codd. et ed. 1 nec non ed. operum Augustini omittit *Deum*.
[2] Per totum et IV. c. 19. et 20. n. 25-30.
[3] Libr. IV. de Trin. c. 20. n. 28: Cum in carne manifestatus est Filius Dei, in hunc mundum missus est.
[4] Parte I. q. 4. — Paulo ante fide plurium mss. ut H I M Z aa bb ff et ed. 1 supplevimus *dicta*, quod forte propter immediate sequentia verba *ut dictum* ex aliis codd. decidit, sed minus bene. Mox post *manifestationem* in cod. K additur *tanquam principale significatum suum*, quod concordat cum subnexis.
[5] Cod. K *manifestantem emanationem et inhabitationem*; aliqui codd. ut A S T V etc. post *manifestantem* incongrue omittunt *personae*.
[6] Ed. 1 *id est, quasi*.
[7] Cap. 11. n. 27: Constitiique et probabilitate rationis, quantum homo vel potius quantum ego potui, et firmitate auctoritatis, quantum de Scripturis sanctis divina eloquia patuerunt, quod antiquis Patribus nostris ante incarnationem Salvatoris, cum Deus apparere dicebatur, voces illae ac species corporales per Angelos factae sunt.
[8] Vers. 19.
[9] Vers. 2
[10] Cap. 21. n. 31.
[11] Cap. 21. n. 31, in quo textu Vat. *tamen ista sive rationali sive intellectuali*, sed falso et contra plurimos codd. nec non ed. operum Augustini.
[12] Vat. cum pluribus mss. hic addit *non*, quod tamen fide aliorum mss. ut B I K M Q T Z etc. et ed. 1, nec non exigente contextu, expunximus. Cod. F habet *missio ibi est, ubi est manifestatio*.

[1] Chapter 17, n. 32, among which words the Vatican edition, contrary to the more ancient codices and edition 1 and even the works of (St.) Augustine, omits *God* [Deum].
[2] Throughout, and in Bk. IV, chs. 19 and 20, nn. 25-30.
[3] On the Trinity., Bk. IV, ch. 20, n. 28: When the Son of God was manifested in the flesh, He was sent into this world.
[4] Part I, q. 4. — A little before this after *commonly* [communiter], trusting in the manuscripts, such as H I M Z aa bb and ff and in edition 1, we have supplied *said* [dicta], which perhaps on account of the immediately following words *as has been said* [ut dictum], fell out of the text of the other codices, though less well. Then after *a manifestation* [manifestationem], in codex K there is added *as its principal signified* [tanquam principale significatum suum], which agrees with what follows.
[5] Codex K reads *manifesting an emanation and an indwelling* [manifestatem emanationem et inhabitationem]; the other codices, such as A S T V etc., after *manifesting* [manifestantem] incongruously omit *of a Person* [personae].
[6] Edition 1 reads *that is, as if* [id est, quasi].
[7] Chapter 11, n. 27: And it is also established by the probability of reason, as much as a man and/or rather as much as I could, and by the firmness of authority, as much as the divine sayings of Sacred Scripture made clear, that to our ancient Patriarchs, before the Incarnation of the Savior, when God was said to appear, those voices or corporeal apparitions [species] were wrought through the Angels.
[8] Verse 19.
[9] Verse 2.
[10] Chapter 21, n. 31.
[11] Chapter 21, n. 31, in which text the Vatican edition reads *either with an rational or an intellectual* [sive rationali sive intellectuali], but falsely and contrary to very many codices and even the works of (St.) Augustine.
[12] The Vatican edition together with very many manuscripts here adds *not* [non], which however we have expunged, trusting in the other manuscripts, such as B I K M Q T Z etc. and edition 1, and as not required by the context. Codex F has *'there is a mission, where there is a manifestation'* [missio ibi est, ubi est manifestatio].

---

p. 280

actu, sed *habitu*, quia aliquid fit vel ostenditur, in quo potest personae emanatio manifestari, et hoc quidem de se importat

as an act, but *as a habit*, because something comes to be and/or is shown, in which the emanation of a Person can be

apparitio.

1. Ad illud autem[1] quod obiicitur in contrarium, quod praecise sit apparitio; dicendum, quod non accipit totam rationem missionis, quia *mitti* non est tantum mente percipi, sed mente percipi ut ab alio emanans et in aliquo inhabitans.

2. Similiter ad illud: mitti invisibiliter est manifestari per effectum invisibilem; dicendum, quod manifestari non dicit totam rationem.

3. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod in missione Spiritus sancti in specie columbae non fuit nisi apparitio; dicendum, quod quamvis non fuerit ibi donatio Spiritus sancti, fuit tamen manifestatio prius dati et tunc inhabitantis in Christo et quiescentis et ab alio procedentis, et ita tota et perfecta ratio missionis; sed ex hoc non sequitur, quod qualiscumque apparitio sit missio visibilis; omnis tamen visibilis missio est apparitio.

manifested, and this indeed "apparition" of itself conveys.

1. To that which is, on the other hand,[1] objected in the Contrary, that precisely (speaking "a mission") is not an apparition; it must be said, that (St. Augustine) does not accept (there) the whole reckoning of mission, because "*to be sent*" is not so much "to be perceived by a mind", but "to be perceived by a mind as One emanating from Another and indwelling in someone".

2. Similarly to this: (that) "to be invisibly sent" is "to be manifested through an invisible effect"; it must be said, that "to be manifested" does not signify [dicit] (its) whole reckoning.

3. To that which is objected, that in the mission of the Holy Spirit in the appearance of a dove there was naught but an apparition; it must be said, that although there was not a donation of the Holy Spirit there, there was, however, a manifestation of a prior given and of One indwelling in Christ at that time and of One resting and of One proceeding from Another, and thus the entire and perfect reckoning of a "mission"; but from this it does not follow, that an apparition of any kind whatsoever is a visible mission; yet every visible mission is an apparition.

SCHOLION.

I. Dupliciter declaratur missio visibilis, primo cum genere proximo *missio* et differentia contrahente *visibilis*, secundo cum genere *apparitio* et differentia contrahente: quae est emanatio personae et inhabitatio. Unde tria in missione visibili requiruntur: emanatio personae, inhabitatio eiusdem et manifestatio utriusque per *apparitionem* aliquam *visibilem*. — Eadem tria ad rationem missionis visibilis requiri, docent S. Thom., Petr. a Tar. aliique. Per has differentias missio visibilis distinguitur ab aliis apparitionibus in textu enumeratis. Si dicit: « Per primum excludit apparitionem Dei in qualibet creatura », verba *per primum* referuntur ad verba: « in qua manifestatur divina *persona* », operatio enim Dei in qualibet creatura est communis tribus personis, unde nullius personae est manifestativa. *Per secundum* refertur ad « manifestatur . . . ut *inhabitans* »; *per tertium* ad « manifestatur ut *emanans* ».

SCHOLIUM

I. A visible mission is declared in a twofold manner, first with the proximate genus '*mission*' and its contracting difference '*visible*', second with the genus '*apparition*' and its contracting difference: 'that which is an emanation and an indwelling of a Person'. Wherefore in a visible mission three (things) are required: the emanation of a Person, the indwelling of the Same and the manifestation of each through some *visible apparition*. — That the same three are required for a visible mission, is taught by St. Thomas, (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise and others. Through these differences a visible mission is distinguished from the other apparitions enumerated in the text. When [si] he says: « Through the first it excludes the apparition of God in any creature etc. », the words *through the first* refer to the words: « in which a Divine *Person* are manifested », for the operation of God in any creature is common to the Three Divine Persons, whence it is manifestive of no

Person (in particular). *Through the second* refers to « is manifested . . . as One *indwelling* », *through the third* to « is manifested as One *emanating* ».

II. Notandum quoad ordinem solutionem ad opp. quod primo respondetur ad argumenta in fundam.; deinde ad ea quae primo loco sunt posit, cum utraque accuratiore determinatione indigeant. — Iuvat hic generatim dicere, quod argumenta in *fundamentis* a S. Bonav. aliisque posita non semper ab auctore approbantur ut vera omni ex parte. Genuina auctoris doctrina repetenda est tum ex responsione ad ipsam quaestionem, tum ex solutione obiectorum.

II. It must be noted in regard to the order of the solution ad oppositum, which first responds to the arguments in the fundament (here the Contrary); then at those which were places in the first position, since each needs a more accurate determination. — Here it helps to say generally, that the arguments in the *fundaments* of St. Bonaventure and others are not always approved by the author as true in their every part. The genuine doctrine of the author is to be sought out both in the Response to the question, and in the Solution of the objections.

III. In substantia responsionis omnes conveniunt. Bonav. Breviloq. p. 1. c. 5, et Comment. in Ioan. c. 1 v. 34. (Suppl. Bonelli t. I.); quoad ministeria Angelorum circa apparitiones II. Sent. d. 10. a. 3. q. 2. ad 5. — Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 74. m. 1, et quoad ministeria Angelorum m. 4. — Scot., de hac et seq. hic et in Report. q. unic. — S. Thom., hic q. 1. a. 1. et quoad ministeria Angelorum a. 4; S. I. q. 43. a. 7. ad 5. — B. Albert., hic a. 1 et seq.; pro hac et seq. q. S. p. I. tr. 7. q. 32. m. 2. a. 2. — Petr. a Tar., hic q. 1. a. 1. 3. 5. — Richard a Med., hic a. 1. 3. 4. — Aegid. R., hic a. 1. princ. a. 1. et 2. — Durand., de hac et seq. hic q. 1. — Dionys. Carth., hic q. 1, et quoad Angelos q. 3. — Biel, de hac et seqq. hic a. unic.

III. All agree on the substance of the response. (St.) Bonaventure, Breviloquium, p. 1, ch. 5, and Commentary on the Gospel of St. John, ch. 1, v. 34 (Bonelli's Supplement, tome I); in regard to the ministry of the Angels concerning apparitions, Sent., Bk. II, d. 10, a. 3, q. 2, in reply to n. 5. — Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I, q. 74, m. 1, and in regard to the ministry of the Angels, m. 4. — (Bl. John Duns) Scotus, on this and the following question, here and in his Reportatio, q. sole. — St. Thomas, here in q. 1, a. 1, and in regard to the ministry of the Angels, a. 4; Summa., I, q. 43, a. 7, in reply to n. 5. — Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 1 ff.; on this and the following question, Summa., p. I, tr. 7, q. 32, m. 2, a. 2. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 1, a. 1 and 2. — Durandus, on this and the following question, here in q. 1. — (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, here in q. 1, and in regard to the Angels in q. 3. — (Gabriel) Biel, on this and the following questions, here in a. sole.

---

[1] Ex multis codd. ut A F G K T V W X Y etc. et ed. 1 supplevimus *autem*, quod hic ut principio responsionis ad aliam partem argumentorum minus bene omittitur. Post *accipit* supple: Augustinus.

[1] From many codices, such as A F G K T V W X Y etc., and edition 1, we have supplied *on the other hand* [autem], which is omitted less well here, the beginning of the response to the other half of the arguments.

---

the English translator. Items in round ( ) brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XVI.

ARTICULUS UNICUS.

Quaestio II.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 280-282.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XVI

ARTICLE SOLE

Question 2

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 280-282.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

QUAESTIO II.

Ad quid sit utilis missio visibilis Spiritus sancti.

Secundo **quaeritur**, ad quid sit utilis missio visibilis, et constat quod ad *efficiendum* nihil confert, quia exterior apparitio nihil interius operatur. Quod etiam non sit utilis ad *innotescendum*, ostenditur sic.

1. Aut est ad manifestandum personae alicuius *emanationem*, aut *inhabitationem*. Non *inhabitatoinem*, quia *nemo scit, utrum odio an amore dignus sit*,[2] et ita nemo, utrum Deus in eo habitet, cognoscit. Et *iterum*, quae utilis est? Esto quod sciat, Deum advenisse, tamen cum ignoret permansurum, nulla videtur.[3] Si ad manifestandam alicuius personae *emanationem*: ergo cum illa notitia omni tempore sit necessaria, scilicet tempore Legis scriptae et nunc, videtur, quod et tunc et nunc deberet[4] esse missio visibilis.

QUESTION 2

For what is the visible mission of the Holy Spirit useful.

Second **there is asked**, for what is the visible mission useful, and it is established that it contributes [confert] to effect nothing, because an exterior apparition works nothing interiorly. That is also not useful to *make anything known* [ad innotescendum], is shown thus:

1. Either it is for manifesting *the emanation* of some Person, or *the indwelling* (of One). Not *the indwelling*, because *no one knows, whether he is worthy of hatred or love*,[2] and thus no one cognizes, whether God dwells in him. And *again*, what use is it? Let it be that one knows, that God has come, yet when he knows not that He is going to remain [permansurum], it seems none.[3] If for manifesting *the emanation* of some Person: therefore since that knowledge [notitia] is necessary in every season, that is, in the season of the written

Quaeritur ergo, quare solum tempore Ecclesiae primitivae?

Law and now, it seems, that both then and now there ought to have been[4] a visible mission. Therefore, it is asked, for what reason (was it) only in the time of the primitive Church?

2. Item, quatumcumque appareat in creatura, non innotescit, nisi revelatio adsit: sed cum adest[5] revelatio, ventum est ad cognitionem veriorem et certiorem, quam quae est a sensu: si igitur habens cognitionem certam non indiget occupari circa cognitionem imperfectam, ergo videtur, quod exterior apparitio omnino superfluat.

2. Likewise, howeverso much He appear in a creature, He does not become known, unless a revelation be present [adsit]: but when a revelation is present,[5] (the revealed) is for a more true and more certain cognition, than that which is by sensing: if, therefore, the one having a certain cognition does not need to be occupied about an imperfect cognition, therefore it seems, that an exterior apparition is entirely superfluous.

3. Item, probatur etiam, quod impediat, sic: affectus, circa bona visibilia occupatus, minus surgit ad bona invisibilia, ergo similiter intellectus: ergo si debet ad perceptionem invisibilium elevari, non debet ei fieri ostensio visibilium; quod si fiat, videtur potius impedire quam iuvari.

3. Likewise, it is also proved, that it impedes, in this manner: the affection, occupied about visible goods, rises less to invisible goods, therefore similarly the intellect: therefore if it ought to be elevated to the perception of invisibles, there ought not be made for it a show of visibles; because if there is, it seems rather to impede than help.

---

[2] Ecclesiastes, 9, 1, ubi Vulgata: Et tamen nescit homo utrum amore, an odio dignus sit. — Vat. cum aliquibus tantum mss. hic et infra in responsione *vel* loco *an*.
[3] Supple cum cod. X: *utilitas*, vel cum ed. 1 *esse utilitas*; cod. H vero addit *ergo frustra*. Immediate post Vat. *Non* loco *Si*, deinde *quia* pro *ergo*, sed emendatur ope mss. (quorum aliqui falso *Sed* loco *Si*, quod saepe saepius etiam alibi contingit) et edd. 1, 2, 3.
[4] Nonnulli codd. ut aa bb *debeat*.
[5] Vat. praeter fidem mss. et ed. 1 minus bene *adsit*, quae post *revelatio* adiungit *interior*. Mox cod. K *superiorem* et cod. W *interiorem* loco *veriorem*.

[2] Ecclesiastes 9:1, where the Vulgate reads: And yet man does not know whether he be worthy of love, or hatred [Et tamen nescit homo utrum amore, an odio dignus sit]. — The Vatican edition, together with only some manuscripts, here and below in the response has *and/or* [vel] in place of *or* [an].
[3] Supply with codex X. *utility*, and/or with edition 1 *to be a utility*, but codex H adds *therefore as a trick* [ergo frustra]. [Trans. Note: this final phrase nulla videtur (*there seems none*) responds to the question which introduces the hypothetical, quae utilis est (*of what use it is*) and hence presupposes as it subject *nothing useful* or in Latin nulla res utilis; for this reason the supposition suggested by the Quaracchi editors, here, is not so good, nor so fitting to the context.]
[4] Not a few codices, such as aa and bb, have *there ought to be* [debeat].
[5] The Vatican edition, not trusting in the manuscripts and edition 1, has less well *be present* [adsit], and adds *interior* [interior] to *revelation* [revelatio]. Then codex K has *a superior* [superiorem], codex W *an interior* [interior] in place of *a more true* [verior].

---

p. 281

4. Item, si missio est ad innotescendum, cum triplex sit in nobis vis cognitiva, scilicet sensus exterior,[1] imaginatio et intellectus, et secundum hanc triplicem vim triplex assignetur visio prophetalis, pari ratione videtur, quod triplex missio deberet

4. Likewise, if the mission is for making (something) known, since there is a threefold cognitive force in us, that is the exterior sense,[1] the imagination and the intellect, and according to this threefold force a threefold prophetic vision is

distingui.

assigned, it seems for an equal reason, that there ought to be distinguished a threefold mission.

Praeterea, cum missio sit ad manifestationem inhabitationis, et Filius inhabitet sicut Spiritus sanctus, quare non est missio visibilis ad manifestandum illam?

Besides, since the mission is for the manifestation of an indwelling, and the Son indwells just as the Holy Spirit (does), for what reason is there not a visible mission to manifest the former?

Sed contra: 1. Quod sit utilis ad innotescendum, videtur, quia cognitio nostra incipit a sensu:[2] ergo si debemus elevari ad perceptionem intelligibilium, congruum et perutile est, quod aliquo modo praevis sit excitatio in sensu per signum. Et hoc est, quod dicit Gregorius:[3] « Dum visibiliter Deum cognoscimus, per hunc in invisibilium etc. »

But on the contrary: 1. That it be useful for making (something) known, seems, because our cognition begins from sensing [a sensu]:[2] therefore if we ought to be elevated to the perception of intelligibles, it is congruous and very useful, that in some manner there be a previous excitation in the sense [in sensu] through a sign. And this is, what (St.) Gregory says:[3] « While we visibly cognize God, we are through this snatched up into the love of invisibles ».

2. Item, sicut miracula ostendunt divinam potentiam, ita signa divinam praesentiam; sed utile fuit et pernecessarium, fidem nostram manuduci per miracula ad cognitionem divinae potentiae: ergo pari ratione per aliqua signa visibilia ad cognitionem divinae praesentiae.

2. Likewise, just as miracles show the Divine Power, so signs the Divine Presence; but it was useful and thoroughly necessary, that our faith be led by hand through miracles to the cognition of the Divine Power: therefore for an equal reason through some visible signs to the cognition of the Divine Presence.

3. Item, missio est ad redimendum hominem perditum; sed homo est perditus secundum naturam visibilem et invisibilem: ergo missio secundum utramque est ei[4] utilis.

3. Likewise, a mission is to redeem man who is lost [hominem perditum]; but man was lost according to visible and invisible nature: therefore a mission according to each is useful for him.[4]

4. Item, familiarius offert suam praesentiam qui se offert secundum sensum et intellectum, quam qui secundum alterum tantum; sed hoc maxime expediebat homini averso, ut converteretur ad Deum: ergo etc.

4. Likewise, more familiarly does one offer his presence, who offers himself according to sense and intellect, than who (does so) according to one of the two only; but this was most expedient for man who had turned away [homini averso], that he be converted to God: ergo etc..

CONCLUSIO.

Missio visibilis Spiritus sanctus utilis fuit, ut personis manuducendis per sensum manifestaretur inhabitatio secundum plenitudinis redundantiam.

CONCLUSION

The visible mission of the Holy Spirit was useful to manifest, for persons who would be led by the hand through the senses, (His) indwelling according to the overflow of (His) fullness.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod missio Filii visibilis propriam et maximam habuit utilitatem, sicut patebit in tertio.[5] Sed nunc de Spiritu sancto dicendum, quod eius missio visibilis utilis est ad manifestandam et emanationem et inhabitationem, sed non qualemcumque inhabitationem nec in[6] omni

I respond: It must be said, that the visible mission of the Son had the proper and greatest utility, just as will be clear in the Third (Book).[5] But now concerning the Holy Spirit it must be said, that His visible mission is useful for manifesting both emanation and indwelling, but not

genere personae.

whatsoever kind of indwelling nor in[6] every genus of person.

Propter hoc[7] intelligendum, quod est inhabitatio duplex, scilicet secundum sanctificationis *sufficientiam*, et secundum plenitudinis *redundantiam*. Illa quae est secundum sanctificationis *sufficientiam*, interius invisibiliter latet; quae vero est[8] secundum *redundantiam*, exterius apparet; et ideo talis inhabitatio in signo visibili et exteriori manifestari debet, sicut factum est in Apostolis.

On this account[7] it must be understood, that there is a twofold indwelling, that is (that) according to *sufficiency* of sanctification, and (that) according to *the overflow of fullness*. That which is according to a *sufficiency* of sanctification, lay hidden within invisibly; but that which is[8] according to *an overflow*, appeared exteriorly; and for that reason such an indwelling ought to be manifested in a visible and exterior sign, just as was done among the Apostles.

Similiter intelligendum, quod duplex est genus credentium. Quidam enim volunt signa, ut puta sensibiles, quidam intelligentiam quaerunt, ut puta iam provecti.[9] Quaerentes signa per haec manuducuntur[10] ad intelligibilia; et propter tales utilis est missio visibilis. Utilis ergo est missio visibilis[11] ad manifestandam inhabitationem plenitudinis redundantis, et hoc personis manuducendis per sensum.

Similarly it must be understood, that there is a twofold genus of believers. For certain ones want signs, as ones sensible, certain ones seek understanding, as ones already advanced.[9] Those seeking signs through these are led by hand[10] to intelligibles; and for the sake of such a visible mission is useful. Therefore a visible mission is useful[11] for manifesting an indwelling of an overflowing fullness, and this for persons being lead by hand through sense.

1. Ex hoc patet primum, quare scilicet non fuit missio visibilis tempore Legis scriptae; quia non erat missio in plenitudine, quoadusque *venit plenitudo temporis*.[12] Patet etiam, quare modo non datur sive mittitur visibiliter; quia iam manuducti sumus ad fidem, unde sicut cesaverunt miracula, ita exteriora signa.

1. From this is clear the first, that is, for what reason was there no visible mission in the season of the written Law, because there was no mission in fullness, up until *the fullness of time had come*.[12] It is also clear, for what reason He is not now given or sent visibly; because we have already been led by hand to the Faith, whence just as miracles have ceased, so exterior signs.

Quod dicitur, quod nemo scit, utrum odio, an amore dignus sit; verum est,[13] nisi Deus dignetur ostendere; et tunc ostendebat, et hoc perutile erat ad fidem roborandam et devotionem excitandam.

That which is said, that no one knows, whether he be worthy of hatred, or of love; is true,[13] unless God deigns to show (him); and at that time He used to show (this), and this was very useful for strengthening the Faith and exciting devotion.

2. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod necessaria est aliqua revelatio; dicendum, quod verum est, nec tamen superfluit apparitio, quia excitat intellectum ad inquisitionem et sic excitando praeparat ad revelationem et post revelationem excitat[14] ad dilectionem. Revelatio enim, etsi sit interior cognitio, tamen adhuc est viatoris, et ideo non evacuat cognitionem apparitionis.

2. To that which is objected, that some revelation is necessary; it must be said, that it is true, and yet apparition is not superfluous, because it excites the intellect to an inquisition and by exciting it in this manner prepares it for Revelation, and after Revelation it excites[14] to love [dilectionem]. For a revelation, even if it is an interior cognition, still, however, belongs to the wayfarer, and for that reason it does not prevent [evacuat] cognition of an apparition.

3. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod visibila impediunt affectum; dicendum, quod visibilia possunt . . .

3. To that which is objected, that visibles impede the affection; it must be said, that visibles can . . .

[1] Vat. addit *et*, quod deest in mss. et ed. 1. — De triplici visione prophetali vide August., XII. de Gen. ad lit. c. 6. n. 15. seqq.
[2] Vide Aristot., III. de Anima text. 39. (c. 8.) et de Sensu et sensibilibus, c. 6. — Mox post *elevari* cod. K *per sensum ad cognitionem intelligibilium*; et paulo infra ed. 1 *fiat* loco *sit*.
[3] Libr. Sacrament., ubi horum verborum ultima pars ita exhibetur: *per hunc invisibilium amore rapiamur*.
[4] Ex antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 supplevimus *ei*.
[5] Libr. III. Sent. d. 1. a. 2.
[6] Plures codd. ut A T etc. cum ed. 1 omittunt *in*. Mox cod. K post *personae* addit *sive hominum*.
[7] Mss. et ed. 1 postulantibus, substituimus *Propter hoc* loco *Propterea*.
[8] Codd. vetustiores cum ed. 1 exhibent verbum *est*, quod in Vat. et cod. cc deest.
[9] Alluditur ad illud Matth. 12, 39: Generatio . . . signum quaerit; et ad illud Daniel. 8, 15: Et quaererem intelligentiam. — Paulo ante Vat. praeter fidem mss. et ed. 1 *sensuales* pro *sensibiles*, et dein contra antiquiores codd. et ed. 1 *quaerentes* loco *quaerunt*.
[10] Vat. perperam et absque auctoritate mss. et ed. 1 *ut per haec manuducantur*, ac paulo post omittit particulam *et*. Plurimi codd. cum ed. 1 *per hoc* loco *per haec*, sed minus bene; dein aliqui codd. ut I P Q Z *intelligentiam* pro *intelligibilia*.
[11] Vat. cum aliquibus codd., omittendo verba *Utilis ergo est missio visibilis* et coniungendo ea quae sequuntur cum praecedenti propositione, sententiam Doctoris distorquet. Lectio in textum recepta exhibetur a multis mss. ut A F G H I K N T V W Y ee ff, quorum tamen plures, forsan decepti ex immediate praecedenti verbo *visibilis*, cum ed. 1 minus congrue omittunt *Utilis*.
[12] Gal. 4, 4. — De seq. prp. cfr. Greg., II. Homil. 29. n. 4. in Evang.
[13] In cod. O additur: *de scientia certitudinis vel potius intelligitur de scientia status finalis*.
[14] Cod. T cum ed. 1 *exercitat*. Mox nonulli codd. ut W X Y Z perperam *delectationem* pro *dilectionem*; cod. cc autem / *ad devotionem et dilectionem*. Dein ex antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 substituimus *enim* loco *autem*, quod Vat. cum cod. cc habet, et quo vis responsionis debilitatur.

[1] The Vatican edition adds *and* [et], which is lacking in the manuscripts and edition 1. — On the threefold vision of the prophets, see (St.) Augustine, On a Literal Exposition of Genesis, Bk. XII, ch. 6, n. 15 ff.
[2] See Aristotle, On the Soul, Bk. III, ext 39 (ch. 8), and On Sense and Sensibles, ch. 6. — Then after *to be elevated* [elevari] codex K has *through sense to the cognition of intelligibles* [per sensum ad cognitionem intelligibilium]; and a little below this edition 1 has *there come to be* [fit] for *there be* [sit].
[3] Liber Sacramentorum, where the last part of these words is exhibited thus: *through this we are snatched up by the love of invisibles* [per hunc invisibilium].
[4] From the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have supplied *for him* [ei].
[5] Sent., Bk. III, d. 1, a. 2.
[6] Very many codices, such as A T etc., together with edition 1, read *according to every genus* etc. [omni genere] for *in every genus* [in omni genere]. Then codex K after *of person* [personae] adds *or of men* [hominum].
[7] As required by the manuscripts and edition 1, we have substituted *On this account* [Propter hoc] in place of *On that account* [Propterea].
[8] The older codices, together with edition 1, exhibit the verb *is* [est], which in the Vatican edition and codex cc is lacking.
[9] An allusion to Mt. 12:39: An evil an adulterous generation seeks a sign [Generatio . . . signum quaerit; and to that of Dan. 8:15: And I sought understanding [Et quaererem intelligentiam]. — A little before this the Vatican edition, not trusting in the manuscripts and edition 1, has *ones sensual* [sensuales] for *ones sensible* [sensibiles], and then contrary to the more ancient codices and edition 1 reads *seeking* [quaerentes] for *seek* [quaerunt].
[10] The Vatican edition faultily and without the authority of the manuscripts and edition 1 (after the first two words of this sentence) reads *so that through these they be lead by hand* [ut per haec manuducantur], and a little after this omits the particle *and* [et]. Very many codices together with edition one have *through this* [per hoc] in place of *through these* [per haec], but less well; then some codices, such as I P Q Z have *understanding* [intelligentiam] for *intelligibles* [intelligibilia].
[11] The Vatican edition together with the codices, by omitting the words *Therefore a visible mission is useful* [Utilis ergo est mission visibilis] and by conjoining those which follow with the preceding sentence, distort the teaching of the (Seraphic) Doctor. The reading received in the text is exhibited by many manuscripts, such as A F G H I K N T V W Y ee and ff, however many of these, perhaps deceived on account of the immediately preceding words *a visible mission is useful* [utilis est mission visibilis], omit together with edition 1 the (first) word (of the Latin sentence) *useful* [Utilis], less congruously.
[12] Gal. 4:4. — On the following proposition, cf. (St.) Gregory (the Great), Homilies on the Gospel, Bk. II, Homily 29, n. 4.

[13] In codex O there is added: *concerning the knowledge of certitude and/or rather is understood concerning the knowledge of (one's) final state* [de scientia certitudinis vel potius intelligitur de scientia status finalis].

[14] Codex T together with edition 1 reads *it exercises* [exercitat]. Then not a few codices, such a W X Y and Z, faultily read *delight* [delectationem] for *love* [dilectionem]; but codex cc reads *to devotion and love* [ad devotinem et dilectionem]. Then from the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1 we have substituted *For* [enim] in place of the *But* [autem], which the Vatican edition and codex cc have, and by which the force of the response is weakened.

---

dupliciter considerari: vel ut res absolutae, vel ut signa et nutus ducentia in aliud.[1] Primo modo si amentur et considerentur, retardant intellectum et affectum; secundo modo iuvant, et sic est in apparitione visibili, quia ibi consideratur creatura ut signum faciens aliud in intellectum venire.[2]

be considered in a twofold manner: either as absolute things, and/or as signs or hints [nutus] leading into something else.[1] In the first manner if they be loved and considered, they do retard the intellect and affection; in the second manner they help, and so it is in the visible apparition, because there a creature is considered as a sign causing something else to come into the intellect.[2]

4. Ad illud quod obiicitur: quare non est triplex genus missionis, quod etsi cognitio sit de ratione missionis, non tamen[3] quaecumque vel cuiuslibet, sed *inhabitantis*. Et quia duplex est modus inhabitandi, ut praehabitum est,[4] ideo tantum est duplex modus mittendi, licet plures sint modi cognoscendi. — *Vel aliter* dicendum, quod Deus in via non cognoscitur nisi aut in *effectu*, aut in *signo*. Si in *effectu*, cum effectus ille sit gratia gratum faciens, quae in sola cadit mente, sic est missio invisibilis: si in *signo*, cum signum sit quod offert se sensui,[5] sic est visibilis. Quia vero imaginaria est earum rerum, quarum imagines in interiori sensu exprimuntur, Deus autem non est talis, ideo de eo non est ponere huiusmodi cognitionem.

4. To that which is objected: 'for what reason is there not a threefold genus of mission', (it must be said) that even if 'cognition' concerns the reckoning of 'mission', however[3] not any (cognition) whatsoever nor (a cognition) of anything, but *of One indwelling*. And because there is a twofold manner of indwelling, as has been had before,[4] for that reason there is only a twofold manner of sending, though there are more manners of cognizing. — *And/or in another manner* it must be said, that God is not cognized on the way except in *an effect*, or in *a sign*. If in *an effect*, since that effect is a grace making one pleasing, which occurs in a mind alone, thus it is a visible mission: if in *a sign*, since a sign is that which offers itself to being sensed [sensui],[5] thus it is visible. But because the power of imagination [imaginaria] belongs to those things, the images of which are expressed in the exterior sense, but God is not such, for that reason there is no positing of this manner of cognition concerning Him.

Ad illud quod ultimo quaeritur, quare non fuit missio visibilis ad manifestandam inhabitationem Filii; dicendum, quod *Filium inhabitare* est dupliciter: aut per gratiam unionis, aut per gratia sanctificationis.

To that which is objected last, 'for what reason was there no visible mission for manifesting the indwelling of the Son'; it must be said, that '*that the Son indwell*' is in a twofold manner: either through the

Primo modo non fuit necessaria manifestatio sive visibilis missio, quia plenissime erat in homine sibi unito, in quo operabatur opera visibilia, in quibus manifestabatur: et ideo non oportebat, alia signa visibilia adhiberi. *Secundo* vero modo non habuit missionem manifestantem inhabitationem talem, quia sanctificatio appropriatur Spiritui sancto; unde sufficiebat, esse missionem visibilem ad manifestandum ipsius inhabitationem, cui sanctificatio appropriatur,[6] cum inhabitatio Filii et Spiritus sancti sint indivisae. Manifestato, quod in homine inhabitet Spiritus sanctus, sufficienter ostenditur, quod et Filius.

grace of union, or through the grace of sanctification. In the *first* manner a manifestation or visible mission was not necessary, because He was most fully in the Man united to Himself, in whom He used to work visible works, in which He was manifested: and for that reason it was not necessary [oportebat], that other visible signs be employed. In the *second* manner, on the other hand, He did not have a mission manifesting such an indwelling, because sanctification is appropriated to the Holy Spirit, whence it used to suffice, that there was a visible mission to manifest the indwelling of Him, to whom sanctification is appropriated,[6] since the indwelling of the Son and of the Holy Spirit are undivided. With it manifested, that the Holy Spirit indwells in man, it is sufficiently shown that the Son (does) too.

SCHOLION.

I. Quaestio resolvitur iuxta duplicem distinctionem, scilicet circa modum inhabitationis et circa genera credentium. Quae hic a S. Bonav. dicuntur de inhabitatione secundum plenitudinis redundantiam diffusius explicantur a magistro eius Alex. Hal., qui (loc. cit.) ita dicit: « Non est (missio visibilis) ad demonstrationem cuiuscumque inhabitationis, sed illius inhabitationis, quae est per *plenitudinem gratiae in alios redundantis*, qualis fuit in *Christo* et aliquo modo in *Apostolis* ». Deinde docet, quomodo in *Christo* fuit influentia plenitudinis dupliciter, scil. per modum causae et per modum doctrinae: per modum causae efficientis quoad divinam naturam, per modum causae meritoriae quantum ad humanam; et quomodo his duobus modis est influentia *gratiae* redundantis in *Sacramentis*, sicut est plenitudo *veritatis* redundans in *praedicatione* Christi. Tum pergit: « Adveniente ergo plenitudine temporis, revelanda erat plenitudo inhabitationis, quoniam illa plenitudo redundare coepit, et hoc sensibilibus et nondum adhuc in fide provectis. Hoc autem fuit, quando Christus baptizatus fuit et praedicare coepit: plenitudo scil *gratiae* ipsius per modum influentiae, quia data est tunc vis regenerativa aquae baptismi; et plenitudo *veritatis* eius per modum doctrinae, quia

SCHOLIUM

I. The question is resolved along a twofold distinction, namely about the manner of the indwelling and about the genera of believers. Those (things) which are said by St. Bonaventure here of the indwelling according to the overflow of fullness are explained more extensively by his master Alexander of Hales, who (loc. cit) says thus: « (A visible mission) is not for a demonstration of any indwelling whatsoever, but of that indwelling, which is through *a fullness of grace overflowing upon others*, which was in *Christ* and in some manner in *the Apostles* ». Then (master Alexander) teaches, in what manner the influence of the fullness (of grace) was in *Christ* in a twofold manner, namely, through the manner of a cause, and through the manner of doctrine: through the manner of an efficient cause in regard to the Divine Nature, through the manner of a meritorious cause as much as regards (His) human (nature); and in what manner there is an influence *of grace* overflowing in *the Sacraments* in these two manners, just as there is a fullness *of truth* overflowing in the Christ's *preaching*. Then he proceeds: « Therefore with the coming of the fullness of time, the fullness of indwelling was to be revealed, since that fullness began to overflow, and this for the sensible and for those not yet advanced in faith. But this was, when Christ was baptized and began to

tunc praedicare coepit et veritatem fidei influere. Et ideo, quia plenitudo eius coepit influere in alios, debuit per signa sensibilia manifstari, ut doctrinae eius citius crederetur ». — « In *Apostolis* autem fuit plenitudo *gratiae* descendens a plenitudine Christi, et etiam quodam modo plenitudo *influentiae*, scil. per modum doctrinae et per modum ministerii. Nam de plenitudine *veritatis* Christi accepimus ex doctrina Apostolorum, de plenitudine *gratiae* per ministerium ipsorum in dispensatione Sacramentorum ». Denique concludit, quod ad ostendendam inhabitationem quantum ad effectum *gratiae* redundantis per modum ministerii Spiritus sanctus visibiliter Apostolis datus sit in *flatu*, quando dictum est eis: Accipite Spiritum sanctum, quorum remiseritis peccat etc. (Ioan. 20, 22); deinde vero in *linguis ingeis* ad ostendendam inhabitationem Spiritus sancti ad effectum plenitudinis *veritatis* redundantis in alios per modum doctrinae.

preach: that is, a fullness of His *grace* through the manner of influence, because then was the regenerative force given to the water of Baptism; and a fullness of His *truth* through the manner of doctrine, because He then began to preach and to inflow the truth of the Faith. And for that reason, because His fullness began to flow into others, it ought to have been manifested through sensible signs, so that His doctrine might be believed more swiftly ». — « In *the Apostles*, moreover, there was a fullness of *grace* descending from Christ's fullness, and also in a certain manner a fullness of *influence*, that is, through the manner of doctrine and through the manner of ministry. For we have accepted from the fullness of Christ's *truth* out of the doctrine of the Apostles, from the fullness of (His) *grace* through their ministry in the dispensation of the Sacraments ». Then he concludes, that for showing the indwelling as much as regards the effect of grace overflowing through the manner of ministry the Holy Spirit was visibly given to the Apostles in (Christ's) *breath*, when there was said to them: Accept the Holy Spirit, whose sins you forgive etc. (Jn. 20:22); however, then in *fiery tongues* for showing the indwelling of the Holy Spirit according to the effect of the fullness of *truth* overflowing into others through the manner of (their) doctrine.

II. Ex conclusione principali deducuntur duo corollaria in textu posita. — Verba in 2. coroll. *sicut cessarunt miracula* non intelliguntur in sensu absoluto, sed quatenus miracula in principio Ecclesiae fuerunt manuductio quasi ordinaria ad fidem. — Quoad triplicem visionem (ad 4.) cfr. II. Sent. d. 10. a. 3. q. 2; III. Sent., d. 23. dub. 4; Hexaëm. Serm. 9.

II. From the principal conclusion are deduced the two corollaries posited in the text. — The words in the second corollary *just as miracles have ceased* are not understood in the absolute sense [because the Saints of all ages have and do and shall work them], but to the extent that miracles were at the beginning of the Church a quasi-ordinary way of leading souls by the hand to the Faith. — In regard to the threefold vision (in reply to n. 4), cf. Sent., Bk. II, d. 10, a. 3, q. 2; Bk. III, d. 23, dubium 4; Hexaëmeron, Sermon 9.

III. Conclusio in re est communis sententia. — Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 74. m. 2. — S. Thom., S. I. q. 43. a. 7. — B. Albert., hic a. 10. — Petr. a Tar., hic q. 1. a. 2. — Richard. a Med., hic q. 2. — Dionys. Carth., hic q. 1 circa fine.

III. The conclusion is in fact [in re] the common sentence. — Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I, q. 74, m. 2. — St. Thomas, Summa., I, q. 43, a. 7. — Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 10. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 1, a. 2. — Richard of Middleton, here in q. 2. — (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, here in q. 1, near

the end.

[1] Alludit ad verba Augustini: Vae his, qui nutus tuos pro te amant etc., supra d. 3. p. I.q. 2. ad 1. allegata; vide etiam ibidem q. 3. ad ult., ubi eadem distinctio in *res* et *signa* occurrit. — Mox post *amentur* Vat., antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 obnitentibus, *vel si* loco *et*.
[2] August., II. de Doctr. christ. c. 1. n. 1: Signum est enim res praeter speciem, quam ingerit sensibus, aliud aliquid ex se faciens in cogitationem venire.
[3] Codd. cum ed. 1 omittunt *tamen*. Mox cod. V *cuiuscumque* pro *cuiuslibet*.
[4] Hic. in corp. quaest.
[5] Cfr. August., II. de Doctr. christ. c. 1. n. 1. Vide supra ad 3. — Paulo infra unus alterque cod ut aa bb *exteriori* pro *interiori*.
[6] Cod. O, addendo hic *praeterea*, verba sequentia tanquam novum argumentum exhibet; sed, ut videtur, minus bene. In fine responsionis plurimi codd. cum ed. 1 post *quod* omittunt *et*.

[1] An allusion to the words of (St.) Augustine: Woe to those, who love Thy hints for Thy sake etc., quoted above in d. 3, p. I, q. 2, in reply to n. 1; see also the same place, at q. 3 in the last reply, where the same distinction occurs between *thing* and *sign*. — Then after *they be loved* [amentur] the Vatican edition, with the manuscripts and edition one striving against this, reads *and/or if they be* [vel si] in place of *and* [et].
[2] (St.) Augustine, On Christian Doctrine, Bk. II, ch. 1, n. 1: For a sign is something besides the appearance, which is born into the senses, causing something else to come into thought out of itself.
[3] The codices together with edition 1 omit *however* [tamen]. Then codex V has *of whatsoever* [cuiuscumque] for *of anything* [cuiuslibet].
[4] Here in the body of the question.
[5] Cf. (St.) Augustine, On Christian Doctrine, Bk. II, ch. 1, n. 1. See above in reply to n. 3. — A little below this one or the other codex, such as aa and bb, reads *exterior* [exteriori] for *interior* [interiori].
[6] Codex O, by adding here *besides* [praeterea], exhibits the words which follow as a new argument, but, as is seen, less well. At the end of the response very many codices together with edition 1omit *too* [et].

 The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quaracchi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation than that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [ ] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator. Items in round ( ) brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XVI.

ARTICULUS UNICUS.

Quaestio III.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XVI

ARTICLE SOLE

Question 3

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S.**

Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 283-285.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 283-285.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

QUAESTIO III.

Quibus modis facta sit missio visibilis.

QUESTION 3

In what manners does the visible mission come to be.

TERTIO QUAERITUR, quibus modis fit[1] missio visibilis. Et accipiuntur diversi modi ex Scripturis. Filius enim visibiliter apparuit in creatura rationali, ut in homine; Spiritus vero sanctus in irrationali, ut puta in columba, igne et flatu. Quaeritur ergo de diversitate horum modorum apparendi; et videtur, quod non fuerint modi[2] convenientes, hoc modo.

THIRD THERE IS ASKED, in what manner does the visible mission come to be.[1] And diverse manners are accepted from the Scriptures. For the Son visibly appeared in a rational creature, as in a man; however the Holy Spirit in an irrational one, as for example in the dove, the fire and the blowing (wind). Therefore, one asks concerning the diversity of the manners of appearing, and it seems, that the manners[2] were not fitting, in this manner:

1. Spiritus sanctus est aeque nobilis persona, ut Filius: ergo in aeque nobili creatura debet manifestari, ut Filius.

1. The Holy Spirit is equally a noble Person, as the Son: therefore in an equally noble creature He ought to be manifested, as (was) the Son.

2. Item, si Filius propter assumtionem humanitatis sive apparitionem *in forma servi* est minor Patre, immo *factus minor Angelis*:[3] ergo multo fortius Spiritus sanctus ex apparitione in igne non tantum minor Deo, sed etiam homine; sed hoc nullo modo congruit: ergo non congruit Spiritui sancto apparere in creatura irrationali. — *Si tu dicas*, quod Filius apparuit in homine assumto et unito, Spiritus autem sanctus non est columbae unitus vel igni; *contra*: unio nihil aufert divinitate: ergo propter unionem non debet dici minor. Si ergo dicitur minor, hoc est propter apparitionem: ergo etc.

2. Likewise, if the Son on account of (His) assumption of humanity or apparition *in the form of a servant* is less than the Father, nay *(has been) made less than the Angels*:[3] therefore much more strongly (is) the Holy Spirit from (His) apparition in fire not only less than God, but also (less) than man; but this is in no manner fitting: therefore it is not fitting for the Holy Spirit to appear in an irrational creature. — *If you say*, that the Son appeared in a man assumed and united (to Himself), but the Holy Spirit was not united to the dove and/or to the fire; *on the contrary*: a union takes nothing away from the Divinity: therefore on account of the union He ought not to be said (to be) lesser. Therefore, if He is said (to be) less, this is on account of the apparition: ergo etc..

3. Item, videtur quod Spiritus sanctus fuit unitus,[4] quia Spiritus sanctus apparebat in illa columba, et non in alia; et *rursus* apparebat ipse ibi,[5] non alia persona: ergo alio modo erat in illa quam Pater et Filius, et aliter in illa quam in alia; sed *aliter* non potuit esse in illa quam alia persona quantum ad substantiam nec quantum ad operationem, quia eadem est substantia et operatio in Trinitate, ergo quantum ad unionem: ergo etc. — *Si tu dicas*, quod apparuit sicut in signo, tunc quaero: aut illud signum fuit a *natura*, aut ab

3. Likewise, it seems that the Holy Spirit was united,[4] because the Holy Spirit appeared in that dove, and not in another; and *again* He Himself appeared there,[5] not another Person: therefore He was in it in a manner other than the Father and the Son (were), and otherwise in it than in others; but He could not be in it *otherwise* than another Person (could) as much as regards substance, nor as much as regards operation, because the Same is Substance and operation in the Trinity, therefore as much as regards union: ergo etc.. *If you*

institutione.[6] Si a *natura*, tunc pari ratione et omnis alia columba; si ab *institutione*, quaeritur: quis instituit?

say, that He appeared as in a sign, then I ask: either that was a sign by *nature*, or by *institution*.[6] If by *nature*, then for an equal reason also every other dove; if by *institution*, one asks: "Who instituted it?"

4. Item, Filius apparuit visibiliter *uno modo* tantum et in una creatura; quaeritur, quare non similiter Spiritus sanctus? et videtur, quod ita deberet esse, quia sicut in Filio nulla cadit varietas, immo omnimoda uniformitas, ita et in Spiritu sancto: ergo debuit apparere tantum in una specie, ut Filius.[7]

4. Likewise, the Son appeared visibly *in one manner* only and in one creature; one asks, "For what reason (did) not the Holy Spirit (appear) similarly?", and it seems, that it ought to have been thus, because just as in the Son there occurs no variety, nay rather an omnimodal uniformity, so also in the Holy spirit: therefore He ought to have appeared only in one appearance [species], as the Son (did).[7]

5. Item, Filius tantum *semel* apparuit visibiliter, quia tantum semel est incarnatus, non amplius. Quaeritur ergo, unde hoc est, quod Spiritus sanctus *pluries* apparuit, ut puta non tantum *semel* in igne, sed etiam quousque dabatur Spiritus sanctus?[8] — *Si tu dicas*, quod illa, in quibus Spiritus sanctus apparuit, statim esse desierunt post apparitionem, et ideo oportuit rursum alia fieri; *tunc* ergo videtur, quod nec illa columba fuerit vera, nec ignis, cum tam columba quam ignis habeant[9] virtutem permanendi; et si hoc in illa apparitione non fuit, tunc ergo non fuerunt vera, sed falsa, et non fuerunt apparitiones, sed praestigia et illusiones, sicut sunt phantasmata daemonum et aliorum magorum.

5. Likewise, the Son only appeared *once* visibly, because He was incarnate only one, not more. Therefore it is asked, "Whence is this, that the Holy Spirit appeared *many times*, as for example not only *once* in the fire?", but also "How long was the Holy Spirit given?"[8] — *If you say*, that those, in which the Holy Spirit appeared, immediately ceased being after the apparition, and for that reason it was necessary [oportuit] that others come into being [fieri]; *then*, therefore, it seems, that neither was that dove a true one, nor the first, since both dove and fire have[9] the virtue to remain; and if this was not in that apparition, then, therefore, they were not true, but false, and they were not apparitions, but deceptions [praestigia] and illusions, just as are the phantasms of the demons and of other mages.

6. Ultimo quaeritur, quare tot modis apparuit Spiritus sanctus, et quare in alia specie in capite quam in membris, ut in Christo et Apostolis?

6. Last there is asked, "For what reason did the Holy Spirit appear in so many manners?", and "For what reason in the Head in a form other than in the members, as (He did) in Christ and the Apostles?"

CONCLUSIO.

Apparitio Filii congruenter facta est semel in una et rationabili substantia unita; Spiritus vero sanctus congruenter apparuit pluries in pluribus et irrationabilibus creaturis ut signis.

CONCLUSION

The apparition of the Son fittingly came to be once, in the one and rational substance united (to Him); however the Holy Spirit fittingly appeared many times in many and irrational creatures as signs.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod finis imponit necessitatem his quae sunt ad finem; ideo modus apparendi sumendus est iuxta finem apparitionis. Apparuit autem Filius in carne, ut esset *mediator*, Spiritus vero sanctus, ut *doctor*, Ioannis decimo sexto:[10] *Cum*

I respond: It must be said, that an end imposes a necessity upon those which are to the end; for that reason the manner of appearing is to be taken up according to the end of the apparition. On the one hand, the Son appeared in the flesh, so that He might

vernerit, docebit vos omnem veritatem. Ad *mediationem* autem necessaria est extremorum separatorum concursio et unum unio, sicut patet; et ideo Filius in creatura apparuit ut unitus. Ad *eruditionem* autem ignorantium intervenit signum;[11] ideo Spiritus sanctus apparuit in creatura ut signatum in signo.

be *Mediator*, the Holy Spirit, on the other hand, that (He might be) *Doctor*, according to the sixteenth (chapter of the Gospel of St.) John:[10] *When He comes, He will each you all truth*. Moreover, for *mediation* there is necessary concourse of separated extremes and a union in one (thing), just as is clear; and for that reason the Son appeared in a creatures as One united (to it). But for the *erudition* of the ignorant a sign[11] intervenes; for that reason the Holy Spirit appeared in a creature as One signed in the sign.

Quoniam ergo nihil est Deo perfecte unibile nisi beatificabile, et hoc solum est substantia rationalis; ideo Filius in sola substantia rationali apparuit.

Therefore, since nothing is perfectly able to be united [unibile] to God unless (it be) beatifiable, and this only a rational substance; for that reason the Son appeared in a rational substance alone.

Quia vero usui *significationis* purae[12] convenit creatura irrationalis magis quam rationalis, ne forte crederetur unita, non tantum significans; ideo Spi- / -ritus . . .

However, because an irrational creature is more fit for the use of pure[13] *signification* than the rational, lest perhaps it be believed (to be) united, not only signifying; for that reason the Holy / Spirit . . .

---

[1] Vat. *fiat*; plures codd. ut A T V X *sit*.
[2] Ex antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 supplevimus *modi*.
[3] Cfr. Epist. ad Philip. 2, 7, et ad Hebr. 2, 7. et 9. — Paulo ante in cod. T post *servi* additur *factus*, in ed. 1 vero *non solum*, quae et paulo infra *Angelo* ponit pro *Deo*.
[4] Ed. 1 *fuerit unitus illi columbae*.
[5] Aliqui codd. ut H I addunt *et*.
[6] Haec signi divisio insinuatur ab Aristotele, I. Periherm. c. 2, et ab August., II. de Doctr. christ. c. 1. 2. n. 2. 3.
[7] Vat., antiquis mss. et ed. 1 refragantibus, omittit *ut Filius*. Paulo ante cod. W *si est in Filio nulla varietas* loco *sicut in Filio nulla cadit varietas*.
[8] Scil. signis visibilibus, quod primis Ecclesiae temporibus frequenter fiebat; vide Act. 8, 17 et 10, 14. — Vat. absque auctoritate mss. et ed. 1 *in specie columbae* loco *quousque dabatur Spiritus sanctus*.
[9] Vat. cum pluribus codd. *habeat*.
[10] Vers. 13, ubi Vulgata: Cum autem venerit ille Spiritus veritatis, docebit etc.
[11] Plura de hoc, sicut et de modo, quo eruditio per signum fit, vide apud August., libr. de Magistro. — Plures codd. ut A I T W Y Z bb cc *signatio* (significatio).
[12] Cod. T *potius* loco *purae* moxque omittit *magis*.

---

[1] The Vatican edition has the verb in the subjunctive; very many codices, such as A T V X, read instead *there be a visible mission* [sit mission visibilis].
[2] From the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have supplied *manner* [modi].
[3] Cf. Philip. 2:7 and Heb. 2:7,9. — A little before this in codex T after [before in the English text] *in the form of a servant* [servi] there is added *made* [factus], but in edition 1 *not only* [non solum], which also a little below this puts *than an Angel* [Angelo] for *than God* [Deo].
[4] Edition 1 reads *may have been united to that dove* [fuerit unitus illi columbae].
[5] Some codices, such as H and I, add *and* [et].
[6] This division of “sign” is hinted at by Aristotle, On Interpretation, Bk. I, ch. 2, and by (St.) Augustine, On Christian Doctrine, Bk. II, chs. 1 and 2, nn. 2 and 3.
[7] The Vatican edition, breaking with the ancient manuscripts and edition 1, omits *as the Son (did)* [ut Filius]. A little before this codex W has *if there is in the Son no variety* [si est in Filio nulla varietas] in place of *just as in the Son there occurs no variety* [sicut in Filio cadit nulla varietas].
[8] That is, ‘by visible signs’, because this happened frequently in the first years of the Church; see Acts 8:17 and 10:14. — The Vatican edition, without the authority of the manuscripts and edition 1, has *once, but also in the appearance of a dove’* [in specie columbae] in place of *once’, but also ‘how long was the Holy Spirit given’* [quousque dabatur Spiritus sanctus].
[9] The Vatican edition together with very many codices has the verb in the subjunctive.
[10] Verse 13, where the Vulgate has: *But when He comes, the Spirit of Truth, He shall teach* etc. [Cum

autem venerit ille Spiritus veritatis, docebit].

[11] For more on this, and on the manner, whereby instruction comes to be through a sign, see (St.) Augustine's book On the Teacher. — Very many codices, such as A I T W Y Z bb and cc have *a signing* (signification) [signatio (signification)].

[12] Codex T reads *an irrational creature is more fit for the use of signification than* [usui significationis potius fit convenit creatura irrationalis quam].

---

p. 284

Spi- / -ritus sanctus apparuit in creatura *irrationali*, quae aliquo modo haberet rationem significandi et exprimendi, sicut flatus significat spirationem, ignis vero dilectionem.

the Holy / Spirit appeared in an *irrational* creature, which had in some manner a reckoning to signify and express, just as the blowing signifies (His) spiration, but fire (His) love [dilectionem].

Rursus, quoniam ad perfectam *mediationem* requiritur, quod mediator sit unus, et quod unio sit inseparabilis; ideo[1] Filii apparitio *singularis* fuit et *indivisbilis*. Sed contra, quia non potest Spiritus sanctus prefecte significari in uno signo, ideo oportuit significari[2] per plura: et ideo Filius uno modo apparuit, sed Spiritus sanctus pluribus. His visis, facile est respondere ad obiecta.

Again, since for a perfect mediation it is required, that the mediator be one, and that the union be inseparable; for that reason[1] the apparition of the Son was *singular* and *indivisible*. But on the contrary, because the Holy Spirit cannot be perfectly signified in one sign, for that reason it was necessary [oportuit] that He be signified[2] through many: and for that reason the son appeared in one manner, but the Holy Spirit in more (manners). With these (reasons) seen, it is easy to respond to the objections.

1. Nam ad illud quod primo obiicitur, quod aeque nobilis est persona Spiritus sancti; dicendum, quod nihil facit ibi nobilitas apparentis, sed finis apparitionis; quia ille ut *mediator*, iste ut *eruditor* sive doctor, ideo Filius ut in homine assumto, Spiritus sanctus ut in creatura et signo.[3]

1. For to that which is objected first, that equally noble is the Person of the Holy Spirit; it must be said, that the nobility of the One appearing causes nothing there, but the end of the apparition (does); because the former as *Mediator*, the latter as *Instructor* or Doctor, for that reason the Son as in a man assumed, the Holy Spirit as in a creature and sign.[3]

2. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod Spiritus sanctus debet dici minor, sicut et Filius; dicendum, quod minoritas illa non dicitur de Filio ratione divinitatis, sed ratione unionis et communicationis[4] idiomatum; quia Filius factus est homo passibilis, sed Spiritus sanctus non est factus columba.

2. To that which is objected, that the Holy Spirit ought to be said (to be) less, just as even the Son; it must be said, that that minority is not said of the Son by reason of the Divinity, but by reason of the union and of the communication of idioms; because the Son has become Man who can suffer [homo passibilis], but the Holy Spirit did not become a dove.

3. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod est unitus columbae; dicendum, quod est unio secundum *veritatem*, et est unio secundum *intentionem*.[5] *Primo* modo uniuntur illa quae uniuntur in natura vel persona; secundo modo uniuntur significatum et signum; et hoc modo unita est persona Spiritus sancti illis formis, in quibus

3. To that which is objected, that He was united to the dove; it must be said, that there is a union according to *truth*, and there is a union according to *intention*.[5] In the *first* manner those are united which are united in nature and/or person; in the second manner are united the signified and the sign; and in this manner the Person of

apparuit.

the Holy Spirit was united to those forms, in which He appeared.

Si autem quaeratur, unde veniebat talis unio; dicendum, quod *dispositive* a proprietatibus creaturae, in quibus nata erat personam Spiritus sancti declarare,[6] sicut *flatus* spiritum, *ignis* amorem, *columba* dona propter fecunditatem. Sed *completive* veniebat hoc[7] a divina ordinatione, quae ordinavit creaturas ad hoc, non instituendo, sed simul formando et instituendo, quia ad hoc solum formabat; et ideo tam columba quam ignis simul cum appartione etiam incepit et desiit.[8]

But if one ask, whence has come such a union; it must be said, that (it has come) *according to disposition* [dispositive] from the properties of the creature, in which (the creature) was bound to declare the Person of the Holy Spirit,[6] just as *a blowing* (declares) spirit, *fire* love, *a dove* gifts on account of fecundity. But this[7] came *according to completion* [completive] from the Divine Ordination, which ordained (these) creatures for this, not by instituting, but by forming and instituting (them) simultaneously, because He formed (them) for this alone; and for this reason both the dove and the fire, simultaneous with the apparition, also began and ceased (to be).[8]

5. Ex hoc patet, quare[9] Spiritus sanctus non tantum *semel* apparuit, sed *pluries*, Filius autem non, quia columba et ignis statim post apparitionem esse desierunt, non autem homo. — Ex hoc patet etiam, quod etsi[10] columba illa et ignis essent verum corpus, tamen nec columba fuit vera columba, quia statim desiit, sed similitudo columbae; similiter nec ignis verus ignis, quia non comburebat. Nec tamen ibi erat aliqua illusio, quia non erat ibi aliqua falsitas in significando. Offerebatur enim sensui ad significandum, quod vere ibi erat; et quia magis attendebatur ratio significandi quam existendi, ideo tamdiu duravit, quamdiu significare potuit vel officium signi implevit. Et quia eadem vi formata est columba, mota et conservata, statim ut vis illa desiit movere, columba et ignis desiit esse.

5. From this is clear, for what reason[9] the Holy Spirit not only appeared *once*, but *many times*, however the Son not (so), because the dove and fire ceased to be immediately after the apparition, but the man (did) not. — From this it is also clear, that even if[10] that dove and fire were a true body, yet neither was the dove a true dove, because it ceased (to be) immediately, but (rather it was) the likeness [similitudo] of a dove; similarly neither the fire a true fire, because it did not burn (anything) up. Yet neither was there any illusion, because there was no falsehood in signifying. For what was offered to sense for signifying, was truly there; and because the reckoning of signifying was attained more than (that) of existing, for that reason it endured as long as it could signify and/or fulfill the office of a sign. And because the dove was formed, moved and conserved by the same force, immediately as that force ceased to move, the dove and fire ceased to be.

6. Ad illud quod ultimo quaeritur, quare tot modis apparuit Spiritus sanctus; dicendum, quod apparitio Spiritus sancti fuit ad manifestandam plenitudinem redundantiae, ut prius habitum est;[11] et quoniam redundantia potest esse tripliciter, ideo tribus modis apparuit. Potest enim esse haec plenitudo per *redemptionem*; et ita fuit in Chirsto, et haec est perfecta gratia per omnem modum. Ideo in Christo apparuit in columba, quia[12] erat pretium redemptionis primogenitorum et erat animal integrum et perfectum. Potest etiam esse per *vitae*

6. To that which is asked last, for what reason did the Holy Spirit appear in so many manners; it must be said, that the apparition of the Holy Spirit was for manifesting the fullness of overflowing, as has been had before;[11] and since there can be an overflowing in a threefold manner, for that reason He appeared in three manners. For there can be this fullness through *redemption*, and thus He was in Christ, and this is a grace perfected through every manner. For that reason on Christ He appeared in the dove, because it[12] was the

influentiam quantum ad sensum et motum, et hoc mediantibus Sacramentis; et haec plenitudo est in sacerdotibus, et ideo datus est eis Spiritus sanctus in specie flatus, Ioannis vigesimo:[13] *Insufflavit in eos dicens: Accipite Spiritum sanctum: quorum remiseritis peccata* etc. Potest etiam tertio modo esse per *cognitionis administrationem* sive doctrinam; et haec plenitudo est in Apostolis et Doctoribus, et ideo Spiritus sanctus apparuit eis in linguis igneis.[14] Ex his patet responsio et sufficientia modorum apparendi et obiectorum.

price for the redemption of the first born and was a integral and perfect animal. There can also be (an overflowing) through *the influence of life* as much as regards sense and movement, and this by means of the Sacraments; and this fullness is in priests, and for that reason the Holy Spirit was given to them in the appearance [specie] of a blowing, according to the twentieth (chapter of St.) John:[13] *He breathed upon them saying: Accept the Holy Spirit: whose sins you forgive* etc.. There can also be (an overflowing) in a third manner through *the administration of cognition* or (through) doctrine; and this fullness is in the Apostles and Doctors, and for that reason the Holy Spirit appeared to them in fiery tongues.[14] From these is clear the response and the sufficiency of the manners of appearing and the objections.

---

[1] In cod. cc. et Vat. deest *ideo*, quod tamen in aliis codd. et ed. 1 habetur.
[2] Supplevimus ex vetustioribus mss. et ed. 1 *significari*.
[3] Codd. aa bb, post *santus* omisso *et*, ponunt *ut signo*.
[4] Fide plurimorum codd. et. ed. 1 substituimus nomen magi usitatum *communicationis* pro *communionis*.
[5] Id est, secundum actum rationis et voluntatis, quae fit vel cum vel sine fundamento in re.
[6] Ita multi mss. ut A D F G I K P Q T V W etc. et ed. 1, dum Vat. cum aliquibus codd. modo passivo et minus apto *persona Spiritus sancti declarari*. In lectione in textum recepta *nata* refertur ad *creaturae*.
[7] Sequimur plurimos codd. cum ed. 1, dum Vat. cum cod. cc ponit *veniebant haec*. Codd. P Q *veniebat unio haec*, cod. S autem omittit *hoc*. Paulo infra Vat. cum cod. cc, ceteris tamen codd. cum ed. 1 refragantibus, *et* loco *quia*, deinde *quia* pro *et ideo*, quibus positis ordo et connexio rationum confunditur. Mox aliqui mss. ut H Y Z cum ed. 1 *et* loco *etiam*.
[8] Ad obiectionem quartam specialis a S. Doctor non est data responsio, qua ipsa iam in corp. quaest. continetur. Vide eitam respectu ipsius infra resp. ad 6.
[9] Praeferimus lectionem plurium codd. ut I T aa bb ff et ed. 1 *quare* loco *quod*. Codd. aa bb paulo ante post *Ex hoc* adiiciunt *etiam*.
[10] Vat. cum pluribus codd. *si* loco *etsi*.
[11] Quaest. praeced. et hic circa finem corp. quaest. — Mox antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 exigentibus, substituimus *tripliciter* loco *triplex*.
[12] Supple: columba, vel pone cum codd. Y Z *quae* loco *quia*. — Cfr. Levit. 12, 6 seqq.
[13] Vers. 22 et 23, ubi Vulgata: Insufflavit et dixit eis: accipite etc.
[14] Act. 2, 3.

[1] In codex cc and the Vatican edition there is lacking *for that reason* [ideo], which, however, is had in the other codices and in edition 1.
[2] We have supplied from the older manuscripts and edition 1 *that He be signified* [significari].
[3] Codices aa and bb, having omitted *and* [et], read *as a sign* [ut signo].
[4] Trusting in very many codices and edition 1, we have substituted the more used term *communication* [communicationis] for *communion* [communionis].
[5] That is, according to an act of reason and will, which comes to be either with or without a foundation in reality.
[6] Thus many manuscripts, such as A D F G I K P Q T V W etc. and edition 1, while the Vatican edition together with some codices, has in the passive mood and less aptly *the Person of the Holy Spirit to be declared* [persona Spiritus sancti declarari]. In the reading received in the text *bound* [nata] refers to the previous *creature* [creatura] (and *in which* to *properties*).
[7] We follow the very many codices together with edition 1, while the Vatican edition together with codex cc puts *these came* [veniebant haec]. Codices P and Q *this union came* [viniebat unio haec], but codex S omits the original *this* [hoc]. A little below this the Vatican edition together with codex cc, breaking with all the other codices and edition 1, has *and* [et] in place of *because* [quia], and then puts *because* [quia] in place of *and for that reason* [et ideo], whereby the order and connection of the reasons are confounded. Then some manuscripts, such as H Y and Z, together with edition 1, have *both* [et] for *also* [etiam].
[8] No response is given to the special, fourth question, by the Seraphic Doctor, for the reason that it is already contains in the body of the question. See also in this regard, below in the reply to n. 6.
[9] We prefer the reading of very many codices, such

as I T aa bb and ff, and of edition 1, *for what reason* [quare] in place of *that* [quod]. Codices aa and bb a little before this, after *From this* [Ex hoc] add *it also* [etiam].

[10] The Vatican edition, together with very many codices, has *if* [si] in place of *even if* [etsi].

[11] In the preceding question and here near the end of the body of the question. — Then as required by the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have substituted *in a threefold manner* [tripliciter] for *threefold* [triplex].

[12] Supply: 'a dove', and/or with codices Y and Z put *which* [quia] for *because it* [quia]. — Cf. Leviticus 12:6 ff.

[13] Verses 22-23, where the Vulgate reads: He breathed upon (them) and said to them. Accept etc. [Insufflavit et dixit eis etc.].

[14] Acts 2:3.

SCHOLION.

I. In hac una quaestione quatuor problemata solvuntur: 1. quot sint missiones et Filii et Spiritus sanccti; 2. quare Filio una et Spiritui sancto plures attribuantur; 3. quare et quo modo Filius appaeruerit ut *unitus*, scilicet unione hypostatica, Spiritus sanctus autem tantum ut « signatum in signo »; 4. cur Filius, factus homo, sit se ipso minor, non vero Spiritus sanctus respectu sui signi (in solut. ad. 2.).

II. Tres tantum enumerantur visibiles missiones Spiritus sancti, quia etiam Magister hoc loco tantum tres affert. A S. Thoma (S. I. q. 43. a. 7. ad 6.) aliisque additur quarta « *in nube lucida* » (Matth. 17. 5), quae ab ipsa Ecclesia insinuatur in Officio Transfigurationis (I. Noct. respons. II.) his verbis: « In spendenti nube Spiritus sanctus visus est ». Iuxta S. Bonav. vero (Comment. in Lucam c. 9. v. 34.) ista nubes significavit humanam Christi naturam.

III. In solut. ad 5. incidit etiam quinta quaestio, utrum illa columba fuerit res mere phantastica, an saltem res corporalis, vel etiam specifice columba realis. Seraphicus mediam viam tenet, sicut etiam B. Albert., Petr. a Tar., Richard. a Med. aliique multi. In eodem sensu loqui videtur ipse S. Thomas et in Comment. hic a. 3. ad 3. et in S. I. q. 43. a. 7. Attamen idem in S. III. q. 39. a. 7. veram columbam fuisse affirmat, quae

SCHOLIUM

I. In this one question four problems are solved: 1. how many mission are there both of the Son and the Holy Spirit; 2. for what reason is one attributed to the Son and many to the Holy Spirit; 3. for what reason and in what manner did the Son appear as *One united*, that is by the Hypostatic Union, but the Holy Spirit only as « One signed in a sign »; 4. why is the Son, made man, less than Himself, but the Holy Spirit not so in respect to His own sign (in solution to n. 2).

II. Only three visible missions of the Holy Spirit are enumerated, because Master (Peter) in this distinction mentions only three. By St. Thomas (Summa., I, q. 43, a. 7, ad 6) and others there is added a fourth « *in the lucid cloud* » (Mt. 17:5), which is hinted at by the Church in the Office of the Transfiguration (1st Nocturne, 2nd. responsorial) with these words: « In the shining cloud the Holy Spirit was seen ». According to St. Bonaventure, however (Commentary on the Gospel of St.Luke, 9:34) that cloud signified the human nature of Christ.

III. In the solution to n. 5 there also occurs a fifth question, whether that dove was merely something fantastic, or at least something corporal, and/or even specifically a real dove. The Seraphic (Doctor) holds a middle position, just as Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, Richard of Middleton and many others do. In the same sense seems to speak even St. Thomas both in his Commentary, here in a.

assertio tantum in sensu maioris probabilitatis dicta videtur, ut ibi observat Caietanus. Hanc opinionem sequitur etiam Uldaricus, « discipulus et imitator Alberti », ut dicit Dionys. Carth., qui et ipse est eiudem sententiae.

3, in reply to n. 3, and in his Summa ., I, q. 43, a. 7. However the same in his Summa, III, q. 39, a. 7 affirms that it was a true dove, which assertion seems to be said only in the sense of one of greater probability, as Cajetan observes on this passage. This opinion even Ulric, « the disciple and imitator of (St.) Albertus (Magnus) » follows, according to (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, who himself also holds this same sentence.

IV. Praeter iam laudatos cfr. Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 74. m. 3. 5. — B. Albert., hic a. 4. seq. — Petr. a Tar., hic q. 1. a. 6. — Richard. a Med., hic q. 5. — Aegid. R., hic 2. princ. q. 1, et 3. princ. q. unica. — Dionys. Carth., hic q. 3.

IV. Besides those already mentioned, cf. Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I, q. 74, m. 3 and 5. — Bl . (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 4 ff.. — Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 1, a. 6. — Richard of Middleton, here in q. 5. — Giles the Roman, here in 2nd. princ., q. 1, and 3rd. princ., q. sole. — (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, here in q. 3.

 The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quaracchi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation than that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [ ] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator. Items in round ( ) brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

PRIMI LIBRI

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XVI.

DUBIA CIRCA LITTERAM MAGISTRI.

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XVI

DOUBTS ON THE TEXT OF MASTER PETER

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 285-286.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 285-286.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

Dub. I.

Doubt I

In parte ista sunt dubitationes circa litteram, et primo dubitatur de hoc quod dicit, quod *Filius in quantum missus, id est factus, minor est Patre*. Contra quod sic obiicitur: omnis actus, secundum quem aliquem contingit fieri minorem, est indignitatis. Si ergo Filius ratione missionis est minoratus, ergo missio pertinet ad indignitatem.[1] *Item*, quandocumque aliquis de aequali fit minor, mutatur; sed Filius ante missionem erat aequalis, et modo est minor: ergo etc.

In this part are the doubts about the text (of Master Peter), and first there is the doubt concerning this which he says, that *the Son inasmuch as (He has been) sent, that is made, is less than the Father*. Against which it is objected in this manner: every act, according to which it happens that someone becomes less, belongs to indignity. If, therefore, the Son by reason of (His) mission has been lessened, therefore (His) mission pertains to indignity.[1] *Likewise*, whensoever anyone from (being) equal becomes lesser, he is changed; but the Son before (His) mission was an Equal, and now He is lesser: ergo etc..

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod quaedam dicuntur de Filio Dei per *essentiam*, quaedam per[2] *unionem*, quae tanta fuit, ut faceret hominem Deum et Deum hominem. *Essentialiter* loquendo, nullo modo Filius Dei est minor; sed hoc dictum est per *unionem*, quia omnia quae dicuntur de homine, possunt dici de Filio Dei, et ita patet, quod nulla ex hoc est indignitas, nulla mutabilitas in eius persona; et sic solvitur utrumque obiectum, quia utraque ratio procedit, intellecto[3] quod secundum eandem naturam fieret minor, secundum quam erat aequalis, et ita desineret esse aequalis. Nunc autem simul est minor et aequalis.[4]

I respond: It must be said, that certain (words) are said of the Son of God through *the Essence*, certain ones through[2] *the (Hypostatic) Union*, which was so great, that it made God man and man God. *Essentially* speaking, in no manner is the Son of God "less"; but this has been said through *the Union*, because all (things) which are said of man, can be said of the Son of God, and thus it is clear, that from this there is no indignity, no mutability in His person; and thus is solved each objection, because each reckoning proceeds, having understood[3] that He became less according to the same Nature, according to which He was an Equal, and thus ceased to be equal. But now He is at once less and equal.[4]

Dub. II.

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit, quod *se ipso etiam minor est Filius*. Videtur enim male dicere, quia maior diversitas importatur per hoc quod est *maior* et *minor*, quam per hoc quod est *alius* et *alius*, quia prima non cadit in divina natura, secunda sic. Si ergo haec est vera: Filius est minor se, ergo et haec: Filius est alius et alius, et ita duae personae, quod non conceditur.

Doubt II

Likewise is asked of this which he says, that *the Son is also less than Himself*. For he seems to speak badly, because a greater diversity is conveyed through that which is *greater* and *lesser*, than through that which is *one (person)* and *another (person)*, because the first does not occur in the Divine Nature, the second does. If, therefore this is true: 'the Son is less than Himself', therefore also this: 'the Son is one and another, and thus two persons', which is not conceded.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod verum est, quod maiorem diversitatem dicunt *maior* et *minor*, quia diversitatem virtutis et naturarum; sed ad hanc[5] diversitatem, quamvis est maior, non sequitur diversitas in persona, quia plures naturae possunt esse in una persona. Quoniam ergo in Christo cadit diversitas naturarum et ita

I respond: It must be said, that it is true, that "*greater*" and "*lesser*" signify [dicunt] a greater diversity, because (in Him there is) a greater diversity of virtue and of natures; but to this[5] diversity, though it is greater, there does not follow a diversity in person, because many natures can be in one person. Therefore, since in Christ there

virtutum, non autem personarum: ideo dicitur *maior* et *minor* ratione diversarum virtutum, non autem *alius* et *alius*, cum non habeat diversas personas.[6]

does occur a diversity of natures and thus of virtues, but not of persons: therefore "*greater*" and "*lesser*" is said (of Him) by reason of the diversity of virtues, but "*one*" and "*another*" (is) not, since He does not have diverse persons.[6]

Dub. III.

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit, quod *minoratus est paulo minus ab Angelis*. Videtur enim falsum, quia super illud ad Hebraeos secundo:[7]

Doubt III

Likewise is asked of this which he says, that *He was lessened for a little while less than the Angels*. For it seems false, because on that (verse) in the second (chapter of the Letter) to the Hebrews:[7]

---

[1] Auctoritate antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1 removimus *Dei*, quod Vat. cum cod. cc perperam addit.
[2] Ed. 1 *propter*.
[3] Cod. I *intelligendo*, cod. dd *utraque obiectio, quia utraque obiectio procedit intelligendo*.
[4] Cfr. hic q. 3. ad 1. et 2.
[5] Cod. X loco *hanc* ponit *talem*, Vat. *naturae*, ed. 1 vero *talem naturae*; alii codd. exhibet lectionem in textum receptam.
[6] Idem dubium solvunt B. Albert., hic a. 11. — Richard. et Petrus, hic in expos. lit.
[7] Vers. 9, in quo textu Vat. contra Vulgatam, antiquiores codd. et ed. 1 *ab Angelis* loco *quam Angeli*. Glossa mox citata sic a Lyrano (Hebr. 2, 9.) exhibetur: « Natura humanae mentis, quae ad imaginem Dei sine peccato, qualem Christus assumsit, solus maior est Deus ». Vat. absque ulla auctoritate mss. et ed. 1 *super omnes* pro *solus Deus*. Paulo ante plurimi codd. post *falsum* omittunt *quia*.

[1] On the authority of the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have removed *of God* [Dei], which the Vatican edition together with codex cc faultily adds.
[2] Edition 1 has *on account of* [propter].
[3] Codex I reads *by understanding* [intelligendo], codex dd has *each objection, because each objection proceeds by understanding* [utraque obiectio, quia utraque obiectio procedit intelligendo].
[4] Cf. here q. 3, in reply to nn. 1 and 2.
[5] Codex reads *such a diversity* [talem diversitatem], the Vatican edition has *the diversity of nature* [naturae diversitatem], but edition 1 *such a diversity of nature* [talem natuae diversitatem]; the other codices exhibit the reading received in the text.
[6] Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus) solves the same doubt, here in a. 1. — Richard (of Middleton) and (Bl.) Peter (of Tarentaise), here in the exposition of the text (of Master Peter).
[7] Verse 9, in which text the Vatican edition, co ntrary to the Vulgate, to the more ancient codices and to edition 1, has *than the Angels* [ab Angelis] in place of *less than the Angels* [quam Angeli]. The Gloss cited next is exhibited by (Nicolas) if Lyra, thus on Heb. 2:9: « Than the nature of the human mind, which according to the image of God (is) without sin, which Christ assumed, which could be depraved by no sin, God alone is greater ». The Vatican edition without the authority of any manuscript and edition 1, has *above all* [super omnes] for *God alone* [solus Deus]. A little before this very many codices after *false* [falsum] omits *because* [quia].

Eum qui modico quam Angeli minoratus est, dicit Glossa: « Natura humanae mentis, qualem Christus assumsit, quae nullo peccato potuit depravari, solus Deus maior est ». *Item*, beata Virgo, quae est pure creatura, est super omnes Angelos exaltata: ergo etc.

Him who for a little while became less than the Angels, the Gloss says: « Than the nature of the human mind, which Christ assumed, which could be depraved by no sin, God alone is greater ». *Likewise*, the Blessed Virgin, who is purely a creature, has been exalted above all the Angels: ergo etc..

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod est loqui de Christo in comparatione ad Angelos quantum ad quatuor, scilicet quantum ad

I **respond:** It must be said, that there is a speaking of Christ in comparison to the Angels as much as regards four (things),

gratiam et quantum ad *naturam mentis* et quantum ad *naturam corporis* et quantum ad *statum passibilitatis*. Quantum ad *gratiam* est simpliciter maior; quantum ad *naturam mentis* saltem non fuit minor, quia, sicut dicit Glossa:[1] « Minor Angelis fuit corpore, non mente »; quantum ad *naturam corporis* minor fuit; quantum autem ad *statum*[2] *passibiliatis* fuit minor et modico minoratus, quia status passibilitatis in statum gloriae et honoris paulo post convertendus erat.[3]

that is as much as regards *grace* and as much as regards *the nature of a mind* and as much as regards *the nature of a body* and as much as regards the *state of possibility*. As much as regards *grace* He is simply greater; as much as regards *the nature of a mind* He was at least not lesser, because, as the Gloss says:[1] « Less than the Angels was He in body, not in mind »; as much as regards *the nature of a body* He was less; but as much as regards the *state*[2] *of possibility* He was less and for a little while lessened, because (His) state of possibility was going to be converted a little while afterwards into a state of glory and honor.[3]

Dub. IV.

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit Hilarius, quod *Pater est maior Filio*, quia si verum est quod dicit, cum idem sit in Deo sapientia, potentia, bonitas et magnitudo: ergo si[4] maior est, et est potentior et sapientior et melior. *Praeterea*, in Deo non est magnitudo molis, sed virtutis: ergo si Pater est maior, est potentior; quod stare non potest. *Item*, *maior* aut dicit *essentiam*, aut *notionem*. Non *essenitam*, quia essentia sunt aequales; si *notionem*, quaero: quam? *Si tu dicas*, quod paternitatem; *contra*: comparatio secundum maius et[5] minus non attenditur nisi in comparticipantibus, unde non dicitur: cygnus est albior corvo; sed Filius non est comparticipans paternitatem: ergo etc. *Item* quaeritur: quare[6] non dicitur maior Spiritu sancto?

Doubt IV

Likewise is asked of this which (St.) Hilary says, that *the Father is greater than the Son*, because if what he says is true, since the Same in God is (His) Wisdom, Power, Goodness and Greatness: therefore if (the Father)[4] is greater, He is also more powerful and more wise and better. *Besides*, in God there is no magnitude of mass [molis], but (rather one) of virtue: therefore if the Father is greater, He is more powerful, which cannot stand. *Likewise*, "*greater*" either means *the Essence* or *a notion*. Not *the Essence*, because They are equal in Essence; if *a notion*, (then) I ask: "Which one?" *If you say*, that which (is) the Paternity; *on the contrary*: a comparison according to greater and[5] lesser is not attained except in co-participants, whence there is not said: "the swan is whiter than the raven"; but the Son is not a co-participant in the Paternity [non est comparticipans paternitatem]: therefore etc.. *Likewise* there is asked: "For what reason is He[6] not said (to be greater) than the Holy Spirit?"

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod in Patre est auctoritas respectu Filii et Spiritus sancti, in Filio respectu Spiritus sancti, et ideo in Patre maior auctoritas et maior fecunditas; et quia nullum nomen ita competit ad exprimendam auctoritatem, sicut hoc nomen *magnus*: ideo dicit Hilarius, quod Pater est maior Filio. Ex hoc patent obiecta, quia *maior* non dicit *essentiam*, sicut potentia et sapientia, sed dicit *notionem*. Si quaeras: quam? dico, quod dicit notionem

I respond: It must be said, that in the Father there is an authorship in respect to the Son and the Holy Spirit, in the Son in respect to the Holy Spirit, and for that reason (there is) in the Father a greater authorship and a greater fecundity; and because no noun is competent to express authorship so much, as this noun "*great*": for that reason (St.) Hilary says that the Father is greater than the Son. From this the objections are clear, because "*greater*"

communiter, sed tamen in ratione principii, sicut subauctoritas in ratione emanantis;[7] et hinc est, quod Pater dicitur maior Filio, quia etsi uterque habeat notionem in ratione principii, Pater tamen in ratione principii tantum,[8] et ideo plus habet de ratione auctoritatis; Spiritus autem sanctus nullius personae est principium, et ideo non comparatur eis secundum maioritatem.[9]

does not mean *the Essence*, as (the Divine) "Power" and "Wisdom" (do), but it means *a notion*. If you ask: "Which (notion)?" I say, that it means a notion commonly, but yet in the reckoning of a principle, just as "subauthority" (does) in the reckoning of an emanation;[7] and hence it is, that the Father is said (to be) "greater than the Son", because even if Each has the notion in the reckoning of a principle, yet the Father (has it) in the reckoning of only a principle,[8] and for that reason has more of the reckoning of authorship; but the Holy Spirit is the principle of no Person, and for that reason He is not compared to Them according to greater-ness [maioritatem].[9]

Dub. V.

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit: *Maior itaque donans est, sed minor* etc. Videtur enim falsum, quia quocumque modo accipiatur *maior*, dicitur relative ad minorem: ergo si est ponere Patrem maiorem, est ponere Filium minorem. *Item*, Pater dicitur maior, quia habet auctoritatem supra Filium: ergo cum Filius habeat subauctoritatem respectu Patris, debet dicit minor.

Doubt V

Likewise is asked of this which he says: *And thus the One granting is greater, but He is not now less* etc.. For it seems false, because in whatsoever manner "*greater*" is accepted, it is said in a manner relative to "the lesser": therefore if there is a positing of the Father as "greater", there is a positing of the Son as "lesser". *Likewise*, the Father is said (to be) "greater", because He has the authorship over the Son: therefore since the Son has a subauthorship in respect to the Father, He ought to be said (to be) "lesser".

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod nihil impedit, quare Filius non dicatur minor Patre ratione subauctoritatis, sicut Pater maior,[10] nisi quia nomina indignitatis in Deo non debent ad usum trahi; vel quia sancti Doctores, quantum possunt, se elongant ab haereticorum fallacia. Ideo cum Hilarius dixisset Patrem maiorem, noluit, quod Filius diceretur minor, ne videretur illa maioritas non tantum auctoritatis, sed etiam inaequalitatis. Et quamvis Hilarius diceret in Patre auctoritatem, non tamen legitur dixisse in Filio subauctoritatem; sed illud verum a magistris est additum in consuetudinem disputantium.[11]

I respond: It must be said, that there is no impediment, for which reason Son may not said (to be) "less than the Father" by reason of (His) subauthority, just as the Father (is said to be) "greater",[10] except that in God names of indignity ought not to be put to use; and/or because holy Doctors, as much as they can, distance themselves from the fallacies of heretics. For that reason when (St.) Hilary said that the Father (is) greater, he was unwilling, that the Son be said (to be) "lesser", lest it seem that greater-ness (be) not only (one) of authorship, but also (one) of inequality. And though (St.) Hilary meant the authorship in the Father, it is not, however, read that he meant (that there was) a subauthorship in the Son; but that true (saying) by masters (of theology) was added into the custom of disputants.[11]

---

[1] Apud Lyranum loc. cit.: Minor ergo Angelis corpore, non mente. Maiores tamen Angeli et homines (homine ?) dici possunt, quia maiores sunt hominis corpore. Maiores sunt et animo, sed in eo

[1] In (Nicolas) of Lyra, loc. cit. (the Gloss is cited thus): Therefore less than the Angels in body, not in mind. However Angels and men can be said (to be) "greater", because they are greater than the body of

tantum quod peccati originalis merito corpus aggravat ipsum animum; sed hoc non in Chirsto etc.

[2] Licet plurimi codd. cum Vat. et ed. 1 habeant *naturam*, praeferimus tamen lectionem codd. L M O, utpote quae membra divisionis a S. Doctore superius positis respondet.

[3] Cfr. B. Albert., hic a. 12. — S. Thom., hic expos. text. — Petr. a Tar., hic q. 1. a. 7, et expos. text. — Richard. a Med., hic q. 6. — Aegid. R., hic circa lit. — Dionys. Carth., hic q. 3. in fine.

[4] Supple cum aliquibus mss. ut F H W Y aa bb *Pater*.

[5] Fide antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1 substituimus *et* loco *aut*. Paulo infra ed. 1 *comparticipans Patri in paternitate* pro *comparticipans paternitatem*. — De hac ratione vide supra d. 8. p. I. dub. 4.

[6] In cod. bb additur *uterque*.

[7] Vide supra d. 13. dub. 4. et d. 15. p. I. q. 1. ad 2. et 3, ac infra d. 20. a. 1.q. 2. ad 4, et d. 27. p. I. q. 2. ad 3.

[8] Ed. 1 addit *scilicet, non principiati*.

[9] Ita vetustiores codd. cum ed. 1, dum Vat. cum recentiore codd. cc *auctoritatem* ponit, sed perperam, quia *auctoritas* est terminus medius conclusionis eliciendae. Cod. dd *minoritatem*, bene et in eodem sensu cum aliis codd.

[10] In cod. K additur *Filio*.

[11] Vat. contra plurimos codd. et ed. 1 *consuetudine*. — De hoc et praecedent dubio agunt B. Albert., hic a. 13; S. Thom., Petr. a Tar. et Richard., hic in expos. textus.

a man. They are also greater than the soul, but in this only, that the body having merited original sin weighs down the soul itself; but this was not in Christ etc..

[2] Though very many codices, together with the Vatican edition and edition 1, have *nature* [naturam], we prefer, however, the reading of codices L M and O, as that which responds to the members of the division posited by the Seraphic Doctor above hits.

[3] Cf. Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 12. — St. Thomas, here in the exposition of the text. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 1, a. 7, and in the exposition of the text. — Richard of Middleton, here in q. 6. — Giles the Roman, here on the text. — (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, here in q. 3 at the end.

[4] Supply with some manuscripts, such as F H W Y aa and bb, *the Father* [Pater].

[5] Trusting in the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have substituted *and* [et] in place of *or* [aut]. A little below this edition 1 reads *a co-participant with the Father in the Paternity* [comparticipans Patri in paternitate] for *a co-participant in the Paternity* [comparticipans paternitatem]. — On this reckoning, see above d. 8, p. I, dubium 4.

[6] In codex bb there is added (as the subject) *each* [uterque].

[7] See above d. 13, dubium 4, and d. 15, p. I, q. 1, in reply to nn. 2 and 3, and below in d. 20, a. 1, q. 2, in reply to n. 4, and d. 27, p. I, q. 2, in reply to n. 3.

[8] Edition 1 adds *that is, (and) not (in the reckoning) of one begun* [scilicet, non principati].

[9] Thus the older codices together with edition 1, while the Vatican edition with the more recent codex cc puts *authorship* [auctoritatem], but faultily, because *authorship* [auctoritatem] is the middle term of the conclusion to be elicited. Codex dd has *lesser-ness* [minoritatem], well and in the same sense with the other codices.

[10] In codex K there is added *than the Son* [Filio].

[11] The Vatican edition, contrary to very many codices and to edition 1, has *in the custom* [in consuetudine]. — This and the preceding doubt are dealt with by Bl. (now St.) Albertus, here in a. 13; by St. Thomas, (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise and Richard (of Middleton), here in their expositions of the text.
